DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 162 LI 002 380

AUTHOR	Casey, Genevieve M.
TITLE	The Future Role and Financial Structure of the Bibliographical Center for Research, Rocky Mountain Region - A Reconnaisance Study.
INSTITUTION	Wayne State Univ., Detroit, Mich. Office of Urban Library Research.
SPONS AGENCY	Bibliographical Center for Research - Rocky Mountain Region, Inc., Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	137p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.95
DESCRIPTORS	*Information Centers, *Information Networks, *Library Cooperation, Library Expenditures, *Library Networks, Library Surveys, Questionnaires, Regional Libraries, State Libraries, Use Studies

ABSTRACT

The Bibliographical Center has three valuable assets: The regional union catalog, a staff with exceptional bibliographical expertise, and a regional organization which has withstood the test of time for more than thirty years. This reconnaisance study outlines the following major options for the Bibliographical Center: (1) continue as it is; (2) negotiate with G.K. Hall and other companies to convert the regional catalog to a distributive form, divide what royalties it receives, and its other assets among its members, and go out of business; (3) attempt to become an independent State agency of Colorado with a direct line for State subsidy; (4) attempt to become an agency of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States with a channel to the states for subsidy and (5) abandon, or minimize its services to state and public libraries, and become the agent of a consortium of universities. The reconnaisance study has brought up to date the intensive investigation performed by Dr. Raynard Swank. This, together with the internal management study reported by Joan Maier would seem to provide enough data for decision making on the future role of the Bibliographical Center. (MF)

ED0 45162

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

② THE FUTURE ROLE AND FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGION - A RECONNAISANCE STUDY

by

① Genevieve M. Casey
Associate Professor, Library Science
Wayne State University

③ Next page

LI 002380

④ Bibliographical Center for Research,
Rocky Mountain Region, Inc., Denver, Col.
Denver, Colorado

⑤ 1969

③ BBR02093

Wayne State University, Detroit Mich.
Office of Urban Library Research
Research Report No.6

Copies made available from

Bibliographical Center for Research
Rocky Mountain Region, Inc.
1357 Broadway
Denver, Colorado 80203

$2.00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. HISTORY, METHOD AND SCOPE OF STUDY 1

II. OTHER COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE REGION 16

III. REGION SERVED BY THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER 25

IV. SERVICES OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER 32

V. FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER . 59

VI. OPTIONS 77

VII. ADDITIONAL STUDIES NEEDED 87

APPENDICES . . . .

Questionnaire 92

Members and Potential Users of the Bibliographical Center by State to Which Questionnaire was Sent 97

Members and Potential Users of the Bibliographical Center by Type of Library to Which Questionnaire was Sent 101

Libraries Contributing to the Regional Union Catalog July, 1969 104

Tables

1. Interlibrary Loan Requests Submitted to Center by State, 1964 - 1968 107

2. Interlibrary Loan Requests Submitted to Center by Type of Library, 1964 - 1968 108

3. Interlibrary Loan Requests Submitted to Center by State, First Quarter, 1968, 1969 109

TABLE OF CONTENTS--(cont.)

Tables Page

4. Interlibrary Loan Requests Submitted to Center by Type of Library, First Quarter, 1968, 1969 110

5. Cooperative Arrangements for Interlibrary Loan . . . 111

6. Union Catalogs to which Libraries in Region Contribute 115

7. Service Bibliographical Center Should Provide Libraries 117

8. Attitudes Toward Expansion of Bibliographical Center 121

9. Interlibrary Loan Volume and Cost - Academic Libraries 125

10. Interlibrary Loan Volume and Cost - Public Libraries. 126

11. Interlibrary Loan Volume and Cost - State Libraries 127

12. Interlibrary Loan Volume and Cost - Special Libraries 128

13. Preferred Methods of Financing Bibliographical Center 129

14. Cost to Libraries of Submitting Cards to Bibliographical Center Regional Catalog. 132

15. Fees Paid to Center by Type of Library, 1964 - 1968 134

CHAPTER I

HISTORY, METHOD AND SCOPE OF STUDY

This study of the Bibliographical Center for Research, Rocky Mountain Region was undertaken at the invitation of its director, Miss Phoebe Hayes and its Board of Trustees, in June, 1969, by Wayne State University's Office of Urban Library Research.

As early as 1965 the Center found itself facing a financial crisis, caught between rising costs, the need for automated equipment to cope with its increasing volume, a fluctuating income resulting from a transaction fee support basis and the reluctance of some of its members to agree to a contract method of funding without further financial analysis.

Even more basically, the Center was questioning whether its present services were those most needed by its members, how it should relate to other existing and emerging networks in the state, region and nation, whether, in fact, a bibliographical center based on locating materials within a region was any longer relevant.

The Bibliographical Center for Research has a long and distinguished history since it was established by Dr. Malcolm Wyer, Director of the Denver Public Library in 1934 as an agency to foster library cooperation in the Rocky Mountain region. Its Constitution (revised in 1964) outlines six (6) general objectives:

1. "To assemble and maintain in the headquarters of the Bibliographical Center, bibliographical collections, resources, aids, and materials essential for or useful in planning, research, and scholarly investigation.
2. To assemble and maintain a union catalog of member, and of other libraries which would increase and expand the services of a union catalog.
3. To develop a center and bureau of information for inter-library loans between member libraries and other libraries in the region; also to assist outside libraries to locate western and regional materials in the libraries in the region.
4. To maintain close relationships with the library of Congress and the National Union Catalog.
5. To take by gift, devise or purchase, and hold and use property necessary or useful for the

purpose of its incorporation, and convey the same.

6. To further cooperation, to develop coordination of resource utilization, and to maintain research services among the institutions of the Rocky Mountain region."

In July, 1965, the Board of Trustees invited Dr. Raynard Swank, Dean of the School of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley, to conduct a survey of the Bibliographical Center, aimed at answering four critical questions:

1. Are the Center's activities worth the costs?
2. How well is the Center accomplishing its intended purpose?
3. How can the Center become of greater service to its membership?
4. How can the Center effectively broaden its base of support?

In September, 1966, after an intensive analysis of the Center's activities, Dr. Swank proposed thirty-one (31) recommendations to the Board of Trustees:

> Recommendation 1. That literature searching and the compilation of bibliographies no longer be stated functions of the Center, insofar as they are based on conventional collections of published bibliographies, and that requests for such service be referred back to the member libraries.
>
> Recommendation 2. That the publication program be

carried forward in accord with present policy and expanded as needs arise, with the Center taking such initiative in identifying needs, locating authors, and soliciting funds as its personnel budget permits.

Recommendation 3. That the Center abandon the idea of a central storage or deposit library, and that arrangements be made for seldom-used materials to be stored and made available in the research libraries of each state or at national research library centers.

Recommendation 4. That the identification and preservation of "last copies" be left to the research libraries of the several states, as part of their programs for the screening of little-used materials contributed by the other libraries of the states.

Recommendation 5. That the Center not undertake to negotiate agreements for the specialization of resources throughout the region, but may encourage agreements at the state and local level.

Recommendation 6. That the surveying and description of library resources of the region be arranged only as part of the Center's publication program.

Recommendation 7. That the Center explore with the research libraries of the region their interest in being solicited as possible participants in the cooperative purchase of major lacunae for housing at the Center, and that, if sufficient interest is expressed, the Center undertake experimentally to negotiate such purchases.

Recommendation 8. That the Center accept responsibility for the continuing development and administration of the mechanized area union list of periodicals in the physical sciences and engineering.

Recommendation 9. That as the nature and functions of regional, mechanized, information processing agencies become more clearly defined, the potentialities of the Center be continously explored with respect to the practicable geographical and other limits of such agencies, and that the Center be exploited as a processing agency to the fullest possible extent.

Recommendation 10. That programs adopted for the Center (1) supplement or augment local and special programs (2) require equipment or competence not widely or locally available, or (3) satisfy inter-jurisdictional needs of special groups or localities.

Recommendation 11. That an ad hoc committee be formed to study the bibliographical needs of the region as they relate to mechanization, the types of systems that would best serve the purposes of the region, especially those of the public libraries, and the relationships of those systems with the Colorado academic libraries processing center.

Recommendation 12. That the primary role of the Center in the field of interlibrary loan for public libraries be the out-of-state location of titles that cannot readily be located in-state through the state library systems, and that the Center continue to seek agreements with the state library agencies for the support of this role in the general interest of all the public libraries of the states.

Recommendation 13. That a conference of representatives of public, academic, school, and special libraries from each of the states of the region be convened by the Center to study the potentialities of a regional network of state library reference systems embracing all types of libraries, with the Center serving as the coordinating agency.

Recommendation 14. That the Mountain-Plains Library Association reaffirm its official sponsorship of, exchange Board memberships with, and contribute to the financial support of the Center, and that consideration be given to using the Center as headquarters of the association and for implementing its cooperative programs.

Recommendation 15. That steps be taken to obtain catalog cards for the Center's Union catalog from all the state library agencies that maintain book collections and from the larger public libraries of each state in the region, and that the responsibility of the state and public libraries to share the burden of lending to out-of-state libraries be made explicit in future agreements for state support of the Center's services.

Recommendation 16. That a consistent state-by-state pattern of full reporting to the Center of acquisitions by the major university and public libraries and by the state libraries be established; that selective reporting of special collections and types of materials continue to be arranged with other libraries; and that a firm policy be formulated and enforced on the kinds of resources that shall or shall not be included in the union catalog.

Recommendation 17. That the libraries of the region report their acquisitions directly to the National Union Catalog as well as to the Center, and that the Center not report regional holdings to the National Union Catalog.

Recommendation 18. That the Center adopt and promote a plan for at least two major libraries in each state to report their acquisitions to the National Union Catalog, and that agreements be negotiated with the Library of Congress about the selective nature of this reporting and the extent to which regional locations would be published.

Recommendation 19. That a special project be undertaken promptly to complete the interfiling, editing and coding of the pre-1956 regional union catalog in order that the cards might be sent to the Library of Congress for the incorporation of selected locations in the published National Union Catalog; and that the pre-1956 regional catalog be gradually abandoned as experience with the published NUC indicates the feasibility of such action.

Recommendation 20. That further discussion with the staff of the National Union Catalog be directed toward establishing the feasibility of publishing additional regional locations in the National Union Catalog for the period 1956 to 1966.

Recommendation 21. That the acquisitional policy statement be revised to include bibliographical publications and reference aids only for the performance of the interlibrary loan function of the Center and the identification and verification of interlibrary loan requests, and for general knowledge of specialized collections and services in libraries and other bibliographical agencies.

Recommendation 22. That the bibliographical collections be inventoried, that the titles in scope of the new acquisitions policy be identified, and that the residue be disposed of.

Recommendation 23. That the Denver Public Library begin to send cards for its acquisitions to the Center's union catalog and to the National Union Catalog.

Recommendation 24. That a new manual on the organization, policies, services, and procedures of the Center be written and published for wide distribution.

Recommendation 25. That travel funds to meetings of the Board of Trustees be budgeted for Board members.

Recommendation 26. That the Board of Trustees, in consultation with the heads of the state library agencies of the region, begin at once to design a new organization for the Center, based on memberships by state library agencies that contract with the Center for services to all types of libraries in their states.

Recommendation 27. That the new Constitution and By-Laws recognize and provide for the administration of special projects of less than region-wide scope through separate staffing under the supervision of the Director and with advice of membership committees.

Recommendation 28. That the initial state allocations for the support of the Center be negotiated on the bisis of all identifiable criteria, such as past use of the Center, population, per capita income, library development, and orientation to Denver as against other library centers.

Recommendation 29. That outside funding be vigorously sought from federal and other sources.

Recommendation 30. That the financial accounting of special projects be separated from that of general region-wide programs.

Recommendation 31. That future budget estimates for the Center show the breakdown of costs by programs and projects.

In general, the Swank report reinforced the concept that the Bibliographical Center as a regional insitution was important, that it had great value for all types of libraries and that it must relate to the national as well as state networks evolving in the United States.

In October, 1966, the Board of Trustees approved twenty-six (26) of Dr. Swank's recommendations, but rejected one of his most basic proposals--number 26, that a new organization be developed, based on memberships by state library agencies contracting with the Center for services to all types of libraries in their states. The Trustees agreed with Dr. Swank that the Center should offer membership to those state agencies which had developed statewide library systems, but affirmed that membership in the Center should be open to all types of libraries as it had been in the past.

Although the Board was not willing to focus its organization upon the state library agencies, it did accept the Swank concept that support should be sought at the state level. The Board voted at the October, 1966 meeting that "the future financial base for permanent operation of the Bibliographical Center must rest on the following propositions:

"(1) A per-request charge is not a sound financial base for permanent operation of the Bibliographical Center;

(2) Direct federal aid and/or foundation grants are desirable but are not considered the base for sound annual financing at this time;

(3) The support of the Bibliographical Center must move to the state level of government. Contractual arrangements with each of the states served by the Center should be effected to cover service costs for academic, public and special libraries.

(4) Initial state allocations for the support of the Center should be negotiated on the basis of all identifiable criteria, including past use of the Center, population, assessed valuation, and per capita income; however, lack of library development in a state, or the orientation of an area to Denver as reflected in greater or lesser use of the Center must be reflected in adjustment of compensation.

(5) Until such time as state or federal funds can be used to pay service costs for all libraries, contracts and agreements should continue to be effected on an individual basis.

(6) A non-member fee based on a per-request charge will have to be estimated.

(7) A membership program should be developed for institutions, businesses, or individuals who wish to support the Bibliographical Center beyond state support according to the following scale:

Individual member	$ 25.00
Contributing member	100.00
Sustaining member	500.00
Patron member	1000.00

(8) It is recognized that the present pattern of

> financial operation cannot be dropped until such time as negotiations with states have been completed. It is agreed that the Finance Committee of the Bibliographical Center establish a financial program for long range financial development to be implemented at a future date, perhaps no later than January 1, 1970. In the meantime, the current financial base will have to be reviewed, modified and expanded."

Since 1966, many new developments have occured on a state, regional and federal level, several of them foreseen by Dr. Swank. Among these new elements are:

1. The Library Services and Construction Act Title III has provided funds to the states to begin linkage of resources across type of library lines.
2. The Library Services and Construction Act Title I, and state aid legislation is continuing to foster new administrative patterns and channels of communication among public libraries.
3. The Higher Education Act has encourage cooperative arrangements between academic libraries.
4. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has enabled instructional materials centers serving several schools and/or school districts.
5. The Medical Library Assistance Act has created regional medical libraries.
6. The Technical Services Act has provided funds to the states for information networks for the benefit

of business and industry.

7. The Federation of Rocky Mountain States has begun to consider an area-wide information network.
8. The Library of Congress is developing its MARC project as well as new national location tools.

Although the Trustees and staff moved vigorously to implement their new financial policy, and have, in fact, developed a budget in which 68% of the Center's income is from a state level, the Center's financial problems continue. The question remains urgent how to distribute its rising costs equitably among its members, how to provide a stable budget allowing for reasonable planning, and more seriously, whether the basic services offered by the Center, of locating and verifying requests for inter-library loan and maintaining a regional union catalog are worth their cost to the members. The financial questions, although urgent, cannot be approached without considering the more fundamental question of the value of the Center to its members. Cost cannot be separated from benefit.

Although the Swank study was comprehensive, the Center's continuing financial straits, and the rapidly changing legislative and electronic picture leave the trustees facing many of the same crucial questions and several new ones, for which the answers proposed by Dr. Swank are no longer sufficient. Among these are:

1. How should the Center articulate with existing projected networks in the region and nation?

2. What, if any, new services should it provide for its members?

3. Should the present policy of inclusion in its Regional Catalog be continued and if not what types of material, and what entries should be included?

4. Should fewer resource libraries be designated in the region and what should these be?

5. What patterns of compensation should be worked out for resource libraries?

6. What relationships should (and could) be negotiated with the Center for Research Libraries--with the Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center--with the Library of Congress?

7. What alternate contract or fee schedules for member libraries would be equitable and feasible?

8. What levels of service should the Center offer?

9. Are there sources of funding in addition to member library fees which could be tapped? Can, in fact, a bibliographical center operate without subsidy?

10. What would additional services cost? Would

member libraries be able (and willing) to pay for these?

11. What relationship should be established with the Federation of Rocky Mountain States?

12. Do records presently being maintained by the Center and by its member libraries provide sufficienct data for an intensive cost-benefit study? What new records would be necessary?

Wayne State University's Office of Urban Library Research agreed with the Center's Board of Trustees to conduct a reconnaisance study to assess how its members now view the Center's present program, what benefit it is to them, what changes, improvements, and/or contractions members would recommend. The intention is not to repeat the excellent Swank investigation, but to bring it up to date in terms of changing circumstances.

Using existing records and the data to be collected during a systems analysis of the Center conducted by a USOE-University of Denver Library Institute during the summer of 1969, the present unit costs and fee schedules will be examined, future costs to provide present levels of service will be projected and the advantages and disadvantages of alternative financial and organizational structures explored.

The reconnaisance study will undertake to identify information on the major state and regional networks in the area and to assess how the Center might relate to them.

The study will assess the need for further investigation of the Center's role and outline the options available to the Board of Trustees in solving the Center's problems.

The recommendations of the study are based upon the following data:

1. A questionnaire addressed to 122 libraries, members and potential users of the Center, selected by the Center's director as representative (See appendix). Answers were received from a total of 59.

2. Interviews with present and past officers of the Bibliographical Center for Research, with directors and staff members of major libraries in the region, with the U.S. Office of Education library program officers in Denver and Dallas, with Mrs. Lura Currier, library consultant who is presently conducting a survey of the Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center, and with Mr. Gordon Williams, Director of the Center for Research Libraries.

3. Extensive interviews with the director of the Bibliographical Center, and examination of files and records.

4. Letters to State libraries in the region requesting information on state and regional networks.

5. A report on a cost analysis of the Center conducted under the direction of Mrs. Joan Maier by a group of librarians participating in an institute during the summer, 1969.[1]

The study would not have been possible without the aid of Dr. Patricia Knapp, Associate Professor, Library Science, Wayne State University, who acted as consultant. Valuable help was also provided by Miss Maryann Duggan, Director of the Industrial Information Services program at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, and by Mrs. Geraldine McIntosh who served as research assistant.

Particular thanks are due to Miss Phoebe Hayes and her staff who gave most generously of their time and candor, to the Board of Trustees and to the many librarians in the region who helped us to understand the problems of the Bibliographical Center for Research, Rocky Mountain Region.

---

1. "A cost study of the Center's present operations". Prepared by Joan M. Maier, Project Leader and Consultant and a Project Team from the Institute on Library System Design and Analysis, Graduate School of Librarianship, University of Denver. The project team under Mrs. Maier's direction included: Miss Anna R. Condit, Library Systems Specialist; Mrs. Joan B. Harrigan, Consultant, Interlibrary Cooperation; Miss Marilyn J. Miller, Coordinator of Elementary Libraries; Mr. Paladugu V. Rao, Reference-Circulation Librarian and Mr. David W. Taylor, Associate State Librarian. The Bibliographical Center contracted with Mrs. Maier for the preparation of this formal report.

CHAPTER II

OTHER COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE REGION

In an effort to gather information on the networks presently operative in the states where the Bibliographical Center has relationships, queries were sent to all state librarians in the area. Although within the time and budget strictures of the reconnaisance study it was not possible to do an exhaustive survey of all networks even in one state, let alone in the entire Mountain-Plains region, the query did attempt to assess how much information on networks has already been collected and what major cooperative projects are now on-going. In addition, question 12 and 14 in the questionnaire asked respondents to list cooperative arrangements for interlibrary loan in which they participated.

Answers were received from state libraries in Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas and Wyoming.

Under the Library Services and Construction Act Title III, all state libraries now are sponsoring some form of state-wide reference network which includes all or several types of libraries in the state. Commonly this includes linking the state library with major public libraries by wide area telephone service, or TWX, and with the major university collections in the state. The state library is usually the switching center for requests (with the exception of Colorado, where a contract has been negotiated with the Bibliographical Center to manage the network, and Kansas where the Topeka Public Library has been designated center for the Kansas Information Circuit). Usually, the major university libraries in each state are conceived primarily as resource libraries for the system, rather than as beneficiaries, although in Oklahoma 19% of the traffic over the teletype network is made up of requests sent by the two state universities to each other and to the medical school campus of the University of Oklahoma (located in another city from the main campus). Commonly, academic, school and special libraries enter the state reference networks through their nearest public library. Of the 28 academic libraries in the region who responded to the questionnaire, 17 or 60% indicated that they participated in state-wide reference networks. Although the tying together of all types of libraries within each state into an effective reference network is progressing, the traditional orientation of state libraries toward public libraries has tended to make the state-wide reference networks largely a linkage of public library systems.

Information projects for business and industry under the State Technical Services Act are being carried on in all states, usually under the auspices of one of the state universities (as in Colorado) or under a state department of economic development. One agency funded partially by the Technical Services Act is the Federation of Rocky Mountain States Incorporated.

Incorporated in August, 1966 as the result of the first Rocky Mountain States Governor's Economic Development Conference, the Federation identifies its purposes as follows in its articles of incorporation:

1. To promote the general welfare of the States of Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, and such other states as may become members, by initiating, stimulating, encouraging, and supporting civic, cultural, educational, business, commercial, scientific, technological, and economic activities and undertakings.
2. To bring together representatives of businesses and public and private agencies and organizations of the Rocky Mountain States, the Federal Government, other states and countries, and to accommodate or deal with such representatives.
3. To accumulate, analyze and disseminate by any means information and publicity advancing the purposes of the Federation or tending to generate interest in and understanding and appreciation of the Rocky Mountain States, their peoples, their opportunities, and their advantages.

4. To acknowledge the need for personal involvement of the governmental leadership of the region through cooperative participation by the Governors of the Rocky Mountain States and their representatives and such other Federal and State officials whose involvement may be required.

A permanent office for the Federation has been established in Denver. In addition to federal funds the individual states contribute to its support on a formula based on population according to the 1960 census. Private businesses also contribute some support. The Federation works through voluntary councils and committees with equal representation from each state. Among its activities are:

1) Regional planning (a Council of State Planners from the eight member states works closely with the Federation staff to coordinate regional planning with individual, in-state short and long range goals);

2) Telecommunications (representatives from each state meet regularly to assess future requirements for education, health and emergency networks and to create public broadcasting activities through program exchange and curriculum development. This activity of the Federation aims "to optimize the best use of all telecommunications systems in the region, and to avoid duplication and the expense of incompatible sub-systems");

3) Research and Education (recognizing that basic and applied research will contribute substantially to the economic growth of the region, the Federation aims to encourage regional academic strengths which can compete with other areas of the country). The Federation also expresses major concern for a regional approach to natural resources, transportation, arts and humanities, and human resources.

As early as August 1966, the Director of the Bibliographical Center initiated a correspondence with the Federation of Rocky Mountain States exploring how the Center, and the major libraries of the states might aid in the information network being considered. At least two formal proposals for pilot projects were submitted, one by the Bibliographical Center, another by the University of Colorado, neither of which were funded although officers of the Federation expressed interest. Late in 1968, a Regional Information Network Group (RING) was officially established as a committee of the Economic Development Council of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States. The group is made up of librarians,and administrators of State Technical Services Agencies from the eight states, and the director of the Bibliographical Center. The group is presently working on an inventory of information resources in the eight state region. The present uncertain future of the Technical Services Act has hampered planning at this time. At the March 28, 1969 meeting in Salt Lake City tentative plans were made for subsequent meetings in the late summer and in October, 1969.

Several state libraries identify local reference networks such as the Denver Metropolitan area network which ties together the major public, special, federal and academic libraries in the Denver-Boulder area by telephone and courier service.

Regional medical libraries for the use of physicians and other health personnel are now being established under the Medical Library Assistance Act to serve multi-state areas as designated by the National Library of Medicine. A regional library to serve Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Kansas, Missouri, Wyoming, Colorado and New Mexico is located at the University of Nebraska Medical Library in Omaha. California, Arizona, Nevada, Utah and Hawaii are served by the University of California at Los Angeles. Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arkansas and Texas are served by the University of Texas, and Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Washington and Alaska by the regional medical library at the University of Washington. In addition, the University of

Colorado Medical Library in Denver has been designated the center for MEDLARS tapes for the region.

In the academic area, networks among state supported colleges and universities were identified specifically in eight states, South Dakota, Texas, Arizona, Colorado, North Dakota, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma. These arrangements sometimes are implemented by a union catalog, as in South Dakota, or by an exchange of catalog cards between major universities, as in Oklahoma, or by union lists of serials. Commonly, they involve communication between institutions by wide area telephone or TWX, preferential handling of inter-library loan requests, free photocopying service and delivery by courier. Regional consortia of colleges and universities within a state were also identified in New Mexico, South Dakota, Colorado, North Dakota, and Texas. The Southwest Academic Library Consortium is a group of college and university libraries from Oklahoma, Texas and New Mexico combined to obtain federal funds and increase library service in a sparsely settled geographic region. In addition to, and supporting the many formal, and myriad informal cooperative arrangements among academic institutions in the Rocky Mountains-Plains area, there are numerous efforts at union lists, such as the Southwest Union List of Serials, the Texas List of Scientific and Technical Serials, the Kansas Union List of Serials, the North and South Dakota Union Lists. A meeting is being sponsored by the Southwest Library Association in October, 1969 to study the feasibility of a union list of serials for that six state region.

Special libraries in the region, in addition to entering into area and state wide reference networks, also participate in national subject networks. The U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wild Life Library in Denver, for instance, lists the U.S. Department of Interior library as a major resource . The IBM Library in Boulder contributes 100% of its cards for new acquisitions to the company union catalog.

The Texas State Library engaged a consulting firm, the Management Research International, Inc. in 1967 to collect information on five Texas networks, the Inter-University Council Network, the Knowledge Network (made up of state supported and private colleges and universities and junior colleges), the Regional Information and Communications Exchange (a Technical Service Act project), the Association for Graduate Education and Research of North Texas, in the Dallas-Fort Worth area and the Texas Information Exchange. Texas State Library has also published in 1969 Preliminary Evaluation of the Texas State Library Communication Network.

In Oklahoma the Department of Libraries received in September, 1969 an Evaluation of the Oklahoma Teletypewriter Inter-Library System. However, no state library, or any other agency in the region, has made an effort to create a comprehensive inventory of the myriad, overlapping networks in any one state, or in the Rocky Mountains-Plains area. If networks are to develop in an orderly fashion, without duplication and/or incompatibility, it would seem urgent that a "resource inventory" such as is being discussed by RING be given high priority. The Bibliographical Center needs this information in order to plan for its future development.

CHAPTER III

REGION SERVED BY THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER

The suggestion has been made by eight libraries responding to the questionnaire, and also by other Colorado librarians in conversation with the survey team, that the Bibliographical Center should minimize, if not abandon its regional character and concentrate its services in the state of Colorado. The reasons given were:

1) As state-wide reference networks develop, the major field for inter-library loan is within each state rather than in the region.

2) For large university and highly specialized technical libraries the "natural" inter-library loan field is not the region, but the nation, even the world.

3) Direct affiliation with a state university, or with the State Library of Colorado, or with the State of Colorado as an independent executive agency would provide the Bibliographical Center with a stable base of support.

4) Such regional activity as seems desirable could be carried out by a Colorado agency under contract with other states.

Counter arguments have also been proposed, maintaining that the Bibliographical Center should not only keep its regional status, but should become even more independent by divorcing itself further from the Denver Public Library.

In 1964, 49.9% of inter-library loan requests received at the Center came from Colorado. During the first quarter of 1968, this proportion had grown to 55%, and by the first quarter of 1969, to 68%. With the Center's contract with the Colorado State Library to manage Colorado's state-wide reference network, more than 60% of the budget in 1968 was derived from this single contract.

In cards submitted to the Regional Union Catalog in the last fiscal year (1968), 35% came from Colorado libraries. It is impossible to identify accurately what proportion of the total requests received at the Center were in fact filled by Colorado libraries.

The Bibliographical Center has long enjoyed a close association with the Mountain-Plains Library Association which includes in its membership the states of Colorado, Wyoming, Kansas, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Utah and Nevada. These states, in the first quarter of 1969, accounted for 89% of the requests received at the Center. The Mountain-Plains Library Association not only expresses its concern for the Bibliographical Center by an annual contribution of $1000, but also provides a channel of communication at its annual meetings, and in its organizational structure, for the Bibliographical Center to reach its actual and potential users.

The Federation of Rocky Mountain States includes four states in the Mountain-Plains Library Association--Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and Nevada, and four others, Arizona, New Mexico, Montana and Idaho. These eight states accounted for 83% of the Center's requests in the first quarter of 1969. In its Articles of Incorporation, the Federation of Rocky Mountain States leaves the door open for other states in the region who may wish to join them. If this federation grows into a strong viable agency, independent of the Technical Services Act, it may, as an official inter-governmental agency, provide a logical sponsor for the Bibliographical Center, preserving the Center's regional character and at the same time giving it an official channel to units of government (states) with taxing and appropriating powers.

In the questionnaire addressed to users and potential users of the Center, question 15 asked respondents to check those states which they considered to be in their natural resources region. Question 16 asked respondents to list the five libraries to which they turned most often for resources beyond their own. The answers to both questions showed wide variation, as is indicated in the following table:

States included in Natural Region	No. of Libraries including	No. of Libraries within state responding to question.
Colorado	48	17
Kansas	39	7
Nebraska	32	--
Utah	31	3
Arizona	30	2
New Mexico	27	5
Oklahoma	24	1
South Dakota	20	4
Texas	18	2
Wyoming	18	4
North Dakota	16	3
Montana	16	--
Missouri	16	--
Nevada	16	--
Iowa	13	1
Idaho	11	--
Minnesota	9	--
California	8	--
Arkansas	5	--
Oregon	4	--
Washington	4	--
Louisiana	2	--

Seven of the eight states included in the Mountain-Plains Library Association are among the ten most frequently checked by respondents to the questionnaire. Four of the eight states in the Federation of Rocky Mountain States are among the "top ten" selected by respondents to the questionnaire.

There is some evidence that libraries tend to think of their natural resources region in terms of states located north and south of them on the map--i.e., Colorado considers Wyoming and New Mexico its most natural neighbors--and also some evidence that the contiguous states in every direction constitute the natural resources region. A more significant consideration surely is where the actual resources are. Forty-eight libraries look to Colorado, and 39 to Kansas, 24 as far afield as Oklahoma, 18 to Texas surely because resources are known to be in the member libraries of the ARL and other good collections in these states.

The Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center, located at the University of Washington serves libraries in Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Idaho. Linkage of the Bibliographical Center with PNBC was recommended by 39 of the 59 respondents to the questionnaire, 26 of them giving this high priority. In a study of the PNBC commissioned by the Washington State Library, Mrs. Lura Currier, Library Consultant, also recommends that close ties be established between the two centers. If this is accomplished, it should be possible for the Bibliographical Center to serve libraries in the Pacific Northwest only through PNBC. Regular teletype communication between the two centers should substantially increase the data bank of resources available to all users west of the Missouri River.

In general, the evidence on "Natural Region" provided by the questionnaire indicates clearly only that

1) Colorado and Kansas are usually considered central to the region

2) The University of Colorado and the Denver Public Libraries are considered major resource libraries over a wide multi-state area

3) Most libraries both academic and public consider collections within the state as their most important resource, and

4) large libraries consider the nation (not the region) their resource basin.

Dr. Swank, in his report, considered the question of the Bibliographical Center's region and concluded that

> The viability of the region in its entirety is open to question. Several peripheral areas are divided in their orientation to Colorado as against other centers of library strength. . . Nevertheless, the surveyor sees no reason to delimit or redefine the region for the purpose of the Center. To the extent that its services are unique and useful and can be paid for they should continue to be accesible to those and even other peripheral areas. . . the viable limits of the region have been, and still are self-defining on the basis of felt need for the services of the Center.

With the exception of the possible re-structuring of the Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center which may result from the Currier report, the rapid strengthening of many of the large academic libraries and the growth of state reference networks, nothing has happened since the Swank report to invalidate his conclusions about the Center's region.

The fundamental question remains whether the Bibliographical Center should continue to be a regional agency at all, not so much what its natural region is.

If the Center elects to continue its present range of services--i.e., primarily verification and location of inter-library loan requests, with some referral--it may find itself moving further in the direction of becoming a Colorado State agency. A subsequent chapter in this report on potential services will further explore reasons for preserving the _regional_ nature of the Center.

CHAPTER IV

SERVICES OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER

Since the financial and organizational structure of the Bibliographical Center cannot be considered apart from its target groups (or market) and the services important to these groups, the present chapter will evaluate services presently being offered by the Center as they are perceived by their users, suggest additional services which might be relevant, and what changes, if any, have occured in the Center's services since the Swank report.

In his survey report, Dr. Swank proposed in discussing new services, that the programs adopted for the Center 1) supplement or augment local and special purpose programs, 2) require equipment or competence not widely or locally available, or 3) satisfy interjurisdictional needs of special groups or localities. These principles, approved by the Trustees in 1966, seem equally valid today as criteria for judging the Center's activities.

The Constitution of the Bibliographical Center gives it authority not only 1) to assemble and maintain bibliographical collections, resources, aids and materials essential for or useful in planning research and scholarly investigations, and 2) to. . . maintain a union catalog of the resources of member libraries and of other libraries, and 3) to develop a center and bureau of information for inter-library loans between members and other libraries in this region, and 4) to maintain close relationship with the Library of Congress and the National Union Catalog, but also, more broadly, to 5) further cooperation, to develop coordination of resource utilization, and to maintain research services among the institutions of the Rocky Mountain Region.

Although the Administration and Trustees of the Center have been interested in expanding the range of services, in fact most of their time and money has been spent in verification and location of items for inter-library loan, and to a lesser degree, the referral of these requests. For this service, their primary tools have been the regional union catalog, which in 1968 was estimated to absorb about 30 % of the total budget, and a collection of bibliographies, many shared with the Denver Public Library. This collection was unique to the region at the time that it was conceived by Dr. Wyer in the thirties, but is today relatively much less important, after major expansion by academic libraries.

From its early period, in addition to its major activity in facilitating inter-library loan, the Center has carried forward a publishing program, although not actively within the last five years. The Center has engaged in some literature searching and compilation of bibliographies and has discussed the idea of establishing a central storage or deposit library for seldom used items in the region. The staff have always engaged in some consultation and education among libraries in the region, partly to share their professional expertise, partly as the normal promotional activity required by the Center itself. During the last five years, as inter-library cooperation accelerated within each state in the region, the education and consultation activity has grown.

Dr. Swank, in his review of Center activities recommended a certain narrowing, not so much of the range of activities presently being carried on, but rather of those traditionally conceived. He recommended that literature searches, the compilation of bibliographies, the idea of a central storage library, the identification and preservation of last copies, and the hope of negotiating agreements for the specialization of resources throughout the region, be abandoned. The Trustees agreed with all of these recommendations, except the one on literature searching which they felt should be conducted under contract with special funding. Dr. Swank further recommended that the acquisition of bibliography be limited only to those tools useful for

> . . .the performance of the inter-library loan function of the Center and the identification and verification of inter-library loan requests, and for general knowledge of specialized collections and services in libraries and other bibliographical agencies.

This recommendation the Trustees also rejected, preferring to give their director "considerable discretion in the selection and retention of individual titles".

Dr. Swank recommended, and the Trustees approved, the continuing of an active publications program, the "recognition of consultation and education as a distinct and important function of the Center", and that the surveying and description of library resources of the region be arranged only as part of the Center's publication program.

Dr. Swank did recommend some additional activities for the Center--the current equivalent of its traditional bibliographic role. These included "the continuing development and administration of the mechanized area union list of periodicals in the physical sciences and engineering", the "exploitation of the Center as a processing agency to the fullest extent possible", a "study of the bibliographical needs of the region as they relate to mechanization". In all of these recommendations the Trustees concurred, although significant implementation has not yet been possible.

In fact, the activity of locating items for inter-library loan, verifying citations when necessary, referring inter-library loan requests under some circumstances has overburdened the present Center staff to the point where there is widespread concern among users about the extended turn-around time. The increased work load, and strictures of time, space and budget have forced the narrowing of services and made impossible the additional services recommended by Dr. Swank and approved by the Trustees.

This evaluation of the benefit to its members of the Center's present services, and proposals for additional or different services is based upon data gathered in the questionnaire recieved from 59 libraries and conversations with Trustees and staff of the Center and with key librarians in the broad region. The section on services for academic libraries was written by Dr. Patricia Knapp. The section on services to business and industry, as well as to special libraries owes much to a day of conversations between Dr. Robert Booth, Chairman, Department of Library Science, Wayne State University, Miss Maryann Duggan, Director, Industrial Information Services, Southern Methodist University, Dr. Knapp and Genevive Casey.

In the questionnaire, in question 17, libraries were asked to rate, in terms of high or low priority, a wide variety of possible services in addition to the present verification, location and referral of inter-library loan requests. Respondents were invited to add other services to the printed list and to star those items which they would be interested in receiving for their own libraries. Question 19 asked whether libraries favored the expansion of the Center, and why. Question 17, the check list of services, was intended not as a definitive list to be voted on by the respondents, and thus considered a mandate to the Bibliographical Center, but rather as a series of suggestions to stimulate thinking about wider services on the part of librarians who might be viewing the Center only as a location agency. The answers indicate at best, only a consensus among 59 libraries in the region (only a small proportion of the total library community) that the Center should offer a wider range of services. What the respondents mean by high or low priority is open to interpretation, and a stated interest in receiving a service could not be considered a commitment. Before any of the specific activities suggested below could be undertaken, the Center would need to verify demand by careful market research.

The location, and to a lesser degree verification, and **referral** services are obviously needed in the region. The fact that the volume of requests has increased 80% between 1964 and 1968, and continues to soar by 74% between the first quarter of 1968 and the same period in 1969 is the best possible evidence of need. On the questionnaire, location services were considered of high priority by 28 respondents (14 academic libraries, 8 public libraries, 2 state and 4 special libraries) and the highest priority (a star indicating interest in receiving for their own library) by 20 additional libraries (10 academic, 4 public, 4 state and 2 special libraries). This means that of the 60 respondents to the questionnaire, 48 gave the location function high priority; only 10 respondents gave location of material no priority.

In 1968, according to the analysis reported by Joan Maier, the Center received requests to locate 20,866 items for inter-library loan, and found 94% of them, certainly a commendable record. As inter-library loan traffic increases with the further development of state wide networks, the volume may be expected to increase. The cost of maintaining manually the union catalog in which

72% of the items were located in the region, and the cost of searching was high in both money and time. The overall average unit cost per item searched was discovered to be $3.77. This includes the 19% of requests which needed to be verified, and searches which were a problem, for one reason or another. Records on how this average cost compares to what it would cost the local library to make its own "hit-or-miss" somewhat random search for items not in its own collection are not available and should be given careful study on a national level. The Industrial Information Service at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, on the basis of a recent cost analysis estimated that their average cost to locate an item for inter-library loan was $5.63. Libraries responding to the questionnaire estimated their average number of attempts to find items for inter-library loan between one and five searches, and their average unit cost in locating items themselves between $.33 and $25.00--a range so broad as to suggest again that estimates are not based on rigorous cost analyses. Even though the Center's cost for locating (and verifying) requests may be reasonable--actually lower than the cost to the member-library performing the service for itself (if, indeed, the necessary bibliographical tools and professional staff were available)--nevertheless, the fact that the Center has fiscal problems and is losing members suggests that some change should be effected in how items are located. Change is further mandated by the fact that the Center's turn-around time is too long. Data collected during the Maier study has not yet been tabulated to document the turn-around time, but universally users feel that it is too long. The exception is the Colorado Public Library requests which are commonly handled within the day. Libraries, with their service orientation may not be very sophisticated about cost analysis, but they are extremely sensitive about providing service rapidly.

Although some rearrangement of procedures might somewhat increase the productivity of the current Center staff, it seems likely that significant reduction of turn-around time would require additional staff which would in turn raise the unit cost of locating to the members. These cost and time factors, plus the specter of increased work load (documented by the increases between 1968 and 1969) force the consideration of a drastic change in the method of locating materials.

It seems obvious that the retrospective union catalog(s) as rapidly as possible be reduced either to microfilm or printed form and distributed to the members, and that a new union catalog, using so far as possible the MARC tapes, be created in machine readable form. Negotiation should begin at once with G.K. Hall and similar companies. If possible, the Center should retain ownership of the (printed or microfilmed) catalog and should deposit it with members on a service fee basis. Libraries in the region would then be spared the time and cost of sending requests to the Center, and could make direct requests for materials in the region.

The use made of the present regional catalog, and the percentage of requests located in the region according to the Maier report (72%) and the fact that the Library of Congress now is not sure to include the Bibliographical Center locations in its retrospective union catalog, would seem to indicate that a regional catalog is necessary and should be continued. For current acquisitions the MARC tapes are beginning to make this feasible.

Dr. Swank recommended that study should be given to sharpening the policies for inclusion in the union catalog. With growth of state-wide networks a demand is rising for state union catalogs of both monographs and serials, including the holdings of the major resource libraries in each state. Some states are also undertaking to tie their network of public libraries together with (book) union catalogs of their holdings. It may be that input for the new regional union catalog (in machine readable form) should result in printed or microfilmed catalogs on a state basis, cumulated for the time being in a data bank which could be queried by the state libraries at the Bibliograpical Center for materials not in the state.

New ways to achieve the present and increasing need for the location of items for inter-library loan should be given priority by the Bibliographical Center Trustees. Thus the staff might be freed to offer additional services needed in the region.

The great majority of libraries of all types responding to the questionnaire placed high priority on the Center's linkage with national subject networks and data banks and with the Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center. The PNBC, as long ago as 1961, estimated its data bank as over seven million cards. Arrangements for regular TWX query between the two bibliographical centers should add significantly to the resources available to users in the Mountain-Plains area.

In line with Dr. Swank's recommendation that the Bibliographical Center be exploited as a processing agency, and that it be concerned with the bibliographical needs of the region as they relate to mechanization, the majority of the respondents indicated that the Center should assume leadership in developing uses for MARC tapes in the region. The questionnaire also showed interest in a variety of bibliographical tools on both state and regional level which would require machine processing such as union lists of serials, microfilms, technical report literature, non-book materials, newspaper holdings, state documents and book catalogs for individual libraries and departmental collections. Only a relatively few libraries have the equipment, time, money and expertise to produce keys to their own collections and none are equipped administratively to work in the entire region.

The questionnaire showed consensus that the Center should serve as a referral center to the information resources of the region and that it should assume leadership in identifying the needs of the region for resources and information services. The almost unanimous opinion expressed in the answer to question 19 that the center should expand and the general sentiment of respect and goodwill toward the Center and its staff expressed to the survey team all confirm that the region looks to the Center for leadership.

Service to State Libraries

In 1966, the Trustees of the Bibliographical Center accepted only partially Dr. Swank's recommendation that they "begin at once to design a new organization based on membership by state library agencies contracting with the Center for services to all types of libraries in their states". The Trustees did undertake to move the Center's support to a state level and by 1968, had reached a point where 60%+ of its budget was from state contracts.

The National Advisory Comission on Libraries in its report to the President identified as one of its five major recommendations the strengthening of state libraries, emphasizing that state library agencies are the key to fruitful partnerships between the federal government and local communities in providing better libraries; that explosions in knowledge and publication demand coordination of all resources on a state level, and that good state government requires a high level of information services which must be provided by state libraries.

The development of state-wide reference networks, coordinating resources in libraries of all types within each state has now begun as Dr. Swank foresaw, under Title III of the Library Services and Construction Act.

The state libraries need the Bibliographical Center to locate materials outside their own states. State networks linking public, academic, school and special libraries with major resources in the state are having dramatic effects on the flow of materials, and on the expectation of citizens about what they can demand of local libraries. In Oklahoma, for example, after 18 months of a teletype network, the requests for inter-library loan received at the state library increased by 36%, and inter-library loan requests at many local libraries more than doubled. Use of the Bibliographical Center by Oklahoma grew from 10 requests in 1967 to 850 requests in 1968. The state wide contracts account for much of the increased volume of requests to the Bibliographical Center.

State wide networks create a demand for union catalogs of book and non-book materials available in the libraries of each state. Some states in the region, such as Nebraska, Kansas, South Dakota are already producing union catalogs. With the MARC tapes it is now technically feasible to produce cumulative joint acquisition lists with location symbols which will become in time union catalogs of library holdings, as a by-product of centralized technical processing. Most, if not all of the state libraries in the Mountain-Plains Region are relatively small agencies which cannot attract the technical competence on their own staffs to produce such tools.

Few state libraries in the region are able to produce a cumulating index to their own state documents although all have statutory responsibility for maintaining the official files of these important records, and most are charged with disseminating them to the libraries of the state. The questionnaire indicated widespread interest, not only among the state libraries, but also among academic and public libraries in a cumulating list of state documents, both by individual state and by region. Documents are invaluable source material for students, require special skills in organization, and are in format awkward to preserve. The suggestion has been made that the Bibliographical Center not only produce a cumulated check list of state documents of the region, but that it go a step further and establish a regional documents center supplying documents on microfilm on request, thereby reducing for each state the cost of widespread distribution of its state documents.

Some states such as Kansas, Nebraska and Oklahoma are mounting centralized cataloging projects for their public library systems. The Bibliographical Center might well explore the possibility of a partnership with the state centers in which the physical handling of the materials would take place within a state and the catalog copy in the form of book catalogs, or cards be supplied by the Center using the MARC tapes.

All state libraries are responsible for information services to state government, both the executive and legislative branches, and not even large state libraries like California, New York or Michigan feel that they are discharging this function adequately. Most state libraries responding to the questionnaire indicated interest in the Center's providing SDI services or literature searches for state government. Such information services tailored to the special needs of state government would be too expensive for any one state, but might well be possible if several states in the region pooled their resources.

As local libraries (especially public and school libraries) in the states improve, many state libraries need to provide a more sophisticated level of training in reference techniques than was previously necessary or possible. With the state contracts especially in Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota, the director of the Center is already participating in reference workshops and similar activities in the states. This kind of consulting and education, using the exceptional professional competence of the Center staff, can be expected to grow in volume and sophistication.

One state librarian in the region after hearing about the present study submitted to the survey team the following cooperative activities in which his state library would like to engage:

1. Shared specialized consultants, i.e.: building consultant(s), service to the blind consultant, "printing and editing" consultant, data processing planner and trainer of personnel, etc.;
2. Coordinated plan for training and development of personnel;
    a. Central planning of workshops for local libraries
    b. Library technicians training program,
    c. Co-sponsorship and planning of training programs for state library staffs.
3. Cooperative planning for use of federally funded programs;
(An example: In 1967,almost all states conducted studies for institutional library service--couldn't we have gotten a better report and plan by having several of us pool our funds and hiring consultants with more expertise than most of us were able to do. The various acts not directly administered by state libraries such as Technical Services, HEA-I-B, Manpower Development and Training, etc. are examples.)
4. Cooperative collection and compilation of statistical data in machine readable form;
5. Union list of serials for service to state governments;
6. Machine readable checklist of state publications and where available;
7. Coordinated plan of acquisitions for material to serve state government;
8. Centralized cataloging service for all types of libraries within each state which will produce a

book catalog giving location of materials;
9. TWX interlibrary loan and reference service network between state libraries to connect to intra-state network;
10. Consultant teams to review surveys and studies of state libraries and make recommendation about same;
11. The "System of State Libraries" might work as the accreditation agency for public libraries (also, might serve as the personnel certification agency--although this should probably be the responsibility of the state libraries many do not have the staff and data processing equipment to initiate this program);
12. Development of a uniform classification system for state documents;
13. Development of a cooperative film resource center.

The state libraries in the Mountain-Plains region need help to provide the range of services to the government and libraries of their states for which they are responsible. The Bibliographical Center could perform an invaluable service by taking initiative in establishing a network of state libraries, and thus providing the individual state library with skill and equipment at the Center to accomplish many functions which are now impossible for it alone. Conversations with the state librarians in the region, as well as letters which accompanied responses to the questionnaire indicate a felt need for the Bibliographical Center to become a kind of service center for the state libraries of the region.

What implication this concept of the Bibliographical Center would have on the financial and organizational structure of the Center will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

In the Mountain-Plains region there are few local libraries able to offer consultant services to business and industry in their information needs. These services might include help in the organization and establishment of company libraries--the cataloging and classifying of materials, the training of staff, aid in planning a budget, staff and equipment, literature searches, the actual administration of computer-based Selective Dissemination of Information programs, as well as the location of materials of all kinds, and referring of requests to the appropriate libraries in the region or the world. The Center director is now getting informal requests to perform these needed services. The Federation of Rocky Mountain States was established because the governors recognized that economic development, including opportunity for research, education and access to information must be approached on a regional basis. Some information activity is going on under the State Technical Services Act, most notably at the University of Colorado, but except for the Colorado unit these programs are limited and lack the competence of the Bibliographical Center staff in information and document transfer. The volume of demand for these services in each state--i.e. the number of businesses and industry needing such services except on an intermittent basis inclines to be small and this argues against the survival of most agencies established under the Technical Services Act if the federal funding expires. As a contribution to the economic development of the region, the Bibliographical Center might undertake an aggressive program to serve (for equitable fees) business and industry and the special libraries already established in the area. It may be that these services could be provided under contract through the state libraries in the region. They might be offered directly, under the auspices of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States (the Regional Information Network Group already provides the framework) or they might be offered in cooperation with the Technical Services Program at the University of Colorado.

Services to industry require direct access to an extensive research collection. If the Bibliographical Center becomes involved in these new programs the adequacy of the collections of the Denver Public Library, especially in science and technology would need to be evaluated. It may be that to provide sophisticated services to business and industry, the Center would need to relocate at the University of Colorado and/or federate with the University's Technical Information Program.

The question must also be weighed, whether special information service could be conducted over a wide, multi-state area since it is dependent on rapid service. SDI services do not require proximity, nor do literature searches. The Center might identify in the region local subject specialists and librarians with whom it could contract for specific services.

Setting up an aggressive, regional program of information services to business and industry, both those with special libraries and those with intermittent information needs, would use the bibliographical competence of the Center staff in a new way and would require the addition of a staff member able to promote this service, and skilled in the techniques of automated information transfer.

Services to Academic Libraries

In the discussion of region, in a earlier chapter, it was indicated that the academic library, depending on its size and program, is likely to define its "natural" region as the state, the nation (perhaps the world), or as the nearest individual libraries with outstanding collections. The emphasis is on access to resources, as rapidly and inexpensively as possible. In general, academic libraries are not particularly interested in services which call for subject or even bibliographical expertise.

Both the questionnaires and the interviews with academic library staff members support this analysis. Of the services suggested in question number 17, consultant work, current awareness service, even verification for inter-library loan, were given high priority by only a scattering of the respondents. Location for inter-library loan, production of union catalogs and lists of various kinds of materials, linkage with other bibliographical centers, and, leadership in the promotion of cooperative developments in the region were given high priority by a majority.

Some of the reasons for these differing priorities were expressed in the interviews. Academic libraries are not accustomed to providing literature searches, current awareness services, and the like, to their patrons. They feel confident of the subject and bibliographical competence they have available on campus, in the faculty, in their own staff, and, increasingly, in the resources of their rapidly growing collections. What they want most of all is fast and inexpensive access to materials, primarily books and serials, not in their own collections. They value the location service of the Bibliographical Center in providing this access but they have doubts about whether it is worth the current fees and they have become more and more impatient with what they perceive as a significant slowdown in service since the advent of contracts with state networks, particularly that of Colorado.

Obviously the orientation of the academic library to the nation, the region, or the state depends most of all upon its size. The large university libraries, those which are themselves major resource libraries for their respective states and for the region, find that an increasing proportion of their own needs must be met by the great research libraries outside the region. "Why," asked one librarian, "should we take the extra step of locating an item through the Bibliographical Center when it can be located through the Library of Congress or sent for directly? Would it not make more sense to contribute funds, if necessary, to support the locating service of the Library of Congress than to continue contributing to a regional service?"

The smaller institution, on the other hand, finds a higher proportion of its needs served within the state and, furthermore, particularly if it is state-supported, appreciates the public relations value of serving citizens of the state through a state inter-library loan network. Logically one might expect an extension of this latter benefit through cooperation among state networks to provide access to that undetermined proportion of materials available in the region but not in the individual state.

The question of what is available--and what should be available--in the region but not in the individual state calls for further discussion.

It seems to have been tentatively decided that the retrospective pre-1956 National Union Catalog will not include entries from the Bibliographical Center union catalog. Since a very high proportion of the entries would not be unique, providing only additional locations for items already included, it is felt that the cost of adding them would not be justified. This conclusion , though perhaps practically unavoidable, might prove to be shortsighted, for its effect clearly will be to remove a potential filter which might have helped to reduce the inter-library loan burden of the great national research libraries. Yet, the significance of this regional filter may be considerably less than its cost and, in any case, will surely decrease as the holdings of individual libraries grow and as state networks are strengthened.

Also relevant to the importance of regional versus state or national enterprises is the matter of cooperative acquisition. The Swank report recommended that "the Center explore with the research libraries of the region their interest in being solicited as possible participants in the cooperative purchase of major lacunae for housing at the Center. . . and undertake experimentally to negotiate such purchases." Furthermore, about two-thirds of our questionnaire respondents gave high priority to cooperative acquisition for storage of unique materials in the region.

A regional cooperative acquisition program would almost by definition be concerned with materials needed frequently enough to be acquired for the region (rather than for the nation by the Center for Research Libraries, for example) and yet not needed enough to be acquired by any one state. It seems to this writer highly doubtful that the volume of acquisitions fitting this definition would justify the cost of establishing and maintaining a centralized acquisition and storage service. Theoretically, cooperative acquisition need not be tied to storage, but as Gordon Williams, Director of the Center for Research Libraries, pointed out, it is much easier to persuade a university library to pay for acquisition of little-used items by a cooperatively maintained storage service than by a competing university. Since a storage service is considered efficient when a high proportion of the items stored is _not_ called for, contributions to a national center would surely be more economical than maintenance of a regional center.

To the extent that there are materials which the region has unique interest in preserving, how can this interest be represented in a national center? The recommendation of the Swank report that the Bibliographical Center explore the possibility of a membership in the Center for Research Libraries has been pursued. So far, cooperative operations have not been accepted as members. It has been suggested that an associate membership might be approved, provided that the dues were based on a standard formula related to the _aggregate_ annual budgets of all the libraries belonging to the Center. But since this would not provide a voting membership, it would not serve the purpose of representing regional interests. A reasonable long-range solution to the dilemma, then, would seem to be formal or informal arrangements through the

Bibliographical Center with one of its member university libraries which is also a member of the CRL to see to it that the acquisition and storage interests of the region are represented.

As indicated above, academic libraries are mainly interested in services which provide access to materials. Results from the questionnaire show that a high proportion of the respondents would like these services extended to materials other than monographs and serials. Though there was not enough agreement to produce a majority of "high priority" checks for any one of these additional types (state documents, newspapers, microfilm, technical reports, or audio-visual materials), one can reasonable infer that tools and services which expand the scope of access to non-book materials in general are considered highly desirable.

And finally, the few scattered checkings of subject-oriented services (consultantship, SDI service for faculty or administration, etc.) suggest that there is a potential market here which aggressive promotion might successfully exploit.

CHAPTER V

FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER

In 1964 prior to the Swank study, the fee schedule for the Bibliographical Center was:

Public Libraries	$25 plus $2 per request
College and University Libraries	$25 plus $2 per request
State Library Extension Agencies	$200 plus $2 if use is in excess of this amount
State and Federal Departments and Institutions	$50 plus $2 per request
Business and Corporate Institutions	$50 plus $2 per request
Non-profit organizations	$50 plus $2 per request
Contributions and Individual Memberships	$10
Non-members of the Center	$3 per request

Averaged number of uses over the two most recent years was the basis for computing the assessment of fees for the next membership year.

This support basis yielded to the Center in 1964 an income of $47,951, approximately 29% of which came from academic libraries, 3% from state libraries, 9% from special libraries, and less than $300 from miscellaneous sources. In the year 1964, the Center's output (in terms of number of items located for inter-library loan) was 11,605. Because the transaction fee basis for support created a widely fluctuating budget with little recognition of a "readiness to serve" factor, or provision for orderly building of the Center as a facility valuable to all library users in the region, the Trustees sought a new financial pattern.

On June 27, 1968, after the Swank report, the Trustees instituted a new membership fee schedule, effective January, 1969, aimed at encouraging support on a state wide basis, but not shutting out individual library memberships:

A. Agencies covered by the State-Wide Support Plan were to be charged "amounts as negotiated and contracted annually, in accordance with services rendered by the Center for the State Agency."

B. Agencies covered by Direct-Support Plan were to be charged "an amount equal to $\frac{1}{4}$ of one percent (.0025) of their current annual operating budget."

Non-members paid the following fees:

A.	Individuals	$ 25.
B.	Contributing Supporters	100.
C.	Sustaining Supporters	500.
D.	Patrons	1000.

Special fees of $5.00 per request were added for non-members. A charge for literature searches was set at "the average hourly salary of the staff performing the search plus clerical costs, plus overhead at 35%." This new fee schedule was the result of over a year of study by the Center's Finance Committee and numerous meetings and consultation with Center members.

In a letter sent to all members in December, 1968, Donald Nelson, President of the Bibliographical Center's Board of Trustees emphasized that the Center was prepared to negotiate billing for 1969 if the new fee schedule worked a hardship on any library.

As guidance to the director in negotiating with the State Agencies for the calendar year 1969, the Board at its meeting in January, 1969, proposed a minimum figure of $5000 for service to a state wide network including all types of libraries.

In April, 1969, the Board minutes indicate that the new fee schedule was not finding total acceptance. The Finance Committee was asked to work on a financial formula which would include (again) Use, Credit Allowances for Use of Materials and Card Contribution, Size of Library Budget, a Minimum Base Figure, a Flat Use Fee to meet operations, plus a Membership Fee to provide growth, research and development. The Board voted that institutions not responding to the billing under the revised schedule be advised that service will be provided on the basis of the $5.00 non-membership fee. There was discussion of the need for a cost-benefit study and an expansion of services.

In May, 1969, the Director tabulated the following report to the Board on the 1969 collection status:

1969 FEE SCHEDULE STATUS
MAY 10, 1969

Number of Institutions	Status	Am't. Paid or Committed	Am't. Est. Collectible	Am't. Not Collectible
23	Paid in full	$41,557	$	$
6	Paid negotiated fee	3,000		8,655
23	Billed in full	23,284		
9	Billed negotiated fee	5,030		13,844
1	Billed-negotiated - requested		250	4,834
9	Negotiating		29,000	13,485
10	Billed-no reply		2,334	2,602
9	Awaiting operating budget		1,025	2,598
22	Dropped			21,793
4	State plan tsfr.			100
114		$72,871	$32,609	$67,911

$105,480

By June 30, 1969, the Statement of Cash Receipts for the first six months of 1969 included:

Public Libraries	$ 783.00
College and Universities	13,770.25
State Library Agencies	47,343.00
Federal Agencies	780.00
Businesses	1,840.29
Non-profit organizations	49.00
Individuals	35.60

A contribution from the Denver Public Library Special.

Fund and a small miscellaneous income from the sale of bibliographies, etc., brought total receipts for the first six months to $66,470.78. If the Director's estimates in May are correct, approximately $39,010.00 will be collected by December 1969, providing a total budget of $105,480.

Costs of operating the Center for calendar year 1969 were estimated at $100,010.44.

In 1969, at least 22 libraries dropped membership in the Center. At the March 10, 1969 meeting of the Trustees the following reasons for disaffiliation were discussed:

1) The unit cost--lack of information about what it is
2) The operating budget of the Center itself
3) The uneven development of state library agencies
4) Local self sufficiency
5) A position of non-involvement in state plans, directed in turn to the Bibliographical Center
6) Reservations by research libraries about serving state or area wide public and school library networks as expressed in the ARL Position Paper
7) Lower cost of services from the Colorado Technical Reference Center

The Maier cost analysis, based on a sampling of 1200 requests, selected at random from the 20,866 requests received by the Bibliographical Center in 1968, documents the following conclusions:

1) The Center was sucessful in finding locations and/or referring requests for 94.54% of requests. (an impressive record especially when one considers that large academic libraries place requests for easy to locate items directly, referring only their more difficult locations to the Center)

Data on the other aspect of user-satisfaction, the speed with which requests were handled by the Center, were gathered by the Maier analysts but not tabulated in time for this report. The Wayne University survey team found widespread dissatisfaction among the libraries on the Center's turn-around time. One state contract user (outside Colorado) estimated average turn-around time as 36 days. Priority was given to Colorado contract requests with effort to handle these requests within 24 hours. It is important that actual turn-around time be verified and that the Center take steps to shorten this time. Implementing some of the recommendations for greater efficiency made by the Maier analysts may somewhat shorten this time. It may also be found that higher fees, based on larger staff, using the regional union catalog essentially in its present (card) form may be the price of a significantly shorter turn-around time.

2) 72.55% of all requests were found in the region, 21.99% outside the region. Data is not available on what percentage of requests were located within the state where the request originated.

3) The unit cost for basic overhead was found to be $1.2347. Actual cost was $25,762.47. This includes rent ($2400 "paid to" the Denver Public Library), administrative overhead ($16,189.31, including travel for staff, benefits for staff,board meetings, and 3/4 of the Director's time) and "Equipment Overhead" ($7173.18, including postage, teletype, telephone, repairs, printing, insurance, bibliographies, professional fees and depreciation on equipment)

4) The unit cost for supplies was .0537 per request

5) Total labor cost, including the cost of maintaining the Union Catalog, pre- and post-processing of requests, and searching the requests and keeping statistics, totalled in 1968 a unit cost of $1.7587.

6) To respond to requests, the sections of the regional union catalog were used in the following proportion:

Pre-1956	48.0%
1956-1965	33.6%
1966-	17.1%

7) Actual cost for searching in Union Catalog for

the Colorado Systems was $.2527--an average of the following costs:

Searching in Pre-1956 file	.4658
Searching in 1956-65 file	.1280
Searching in 1966- file	.1643

8) Actual cost for searching in Union Catalog for other requests:

In pre-1956 files	.3232
In 1956-1965 files	.2726
In 1966- files	.1918

9) 19.1% of requests received were unverified.

10) Overall unit cost of the Center per request was $3.77 although this estimate is too rough for billing purposes.

The Maier report also documents that some efficiencies could be effected in the operation of the Bibliographical Center--that both director and her assistant work uncounted hours overtime, and that the director must be freed from the day to day routines in order to engage in long range planning.

The Maier report recommends that financing be entirely on a state basis, and that it be based upon use rather than ability to pay. The report further recommends that a full time administrative assistant and a part time systems analyst be budgeted for the Center.

In the questionnaire, libraries were asked to check preferences for one or more of six financial patterns for the Center, with opportunity to add a seventh pattern of their own choice. The six choices given were :

1) An umbrella fee schedule by which basic membership in the Center is negotiated for all libraries within a state;
2) Individual membership based on a proportion of the library's budget;
3) Basic fee entitling member to a drawing account on X number of transactions, with periodic billing for additional services;
4) Reorganization of the Center as a state agency with contracts for users outside the state;
5) Reorganization of the Center as an agency serving a consortium of universities, with provision for services on a transaction basis to other users;
6) A basic membership fee plus additional charges based upon levels and varieties of services;
7) Other

Most respondents checked more than one possible pattern. The majority of the academic, special and public libraries favored a basic fee plus an additional charge based on levels or kinds of service used. Six of the eight state libraries responding favored an umbrella fee schedule for all libraries within the state. This was also checked by nine of the 28 academic libraries responding, and seven of the 12 public libraries. Eight libraries (six of them in Colorado) recommended that the

Center be reorganized as a state agency. Only a few libraries favored a membership based on a proportion of the library's budget. A few academic libraries recommended that the Center become an agency serving a consortium of universities.

All of the evidence, from past and current experience of the Bibliographical Center, plus the Maier analysis, plus the wishes of the membership as expressed in the questionnaire and in conversation with the survey team tend to fortify the conclusion of the Swank Report--if the Bibliographical Center is to continue to be a regional agency, it must base its support on contracts with the states for service to all libraries within the state.

A support formula should contain the following elements:

1) It should be demonstrably equitable to all users.
2) It should be simple enough to be widely understood, and predictable for future financing.
3) It should be simple enough to administer without excessive bookkeeping costs.
4) It should provide the Center with a stable income, sufficient to allow for research and development of new services (or long range planning).
5) It should be flexible enough to allow for expanded services in kind or in volume to individual states.
6) It should encourage--not inhibit--use of the

Center, and its continuing development as a resource for the entire region.

7) It should provide some compensation to the resource libraries contributing to the union catalog.

It seems uncontroversial to the Wayne University survey team that the Center should move immediately to get the retrospective union catalog(s) into a form which can be distributed (either print or microfilm) and undertake a new regional catalog based on major resources in each state, in machine readable form, also capable of distribution to the members. The present method is costly, unwieldy and really unworkable, as indicated by 1) turn-around time in processing requests at the Center, 2) back-log of filing, 3) increasing need for space, 4) composite cost to the libraries in time and communication charges to query the catalogs at the Bibliographical Center. The fact that 72 % of the requests sent to the Center in 1968 were located within the region emphasizes the value of a regional location tool. The further consideration that the Library of Congress is not committed to include Bibliographical Center locations in the retrospective National Union Catalog makes it more important to preserve this record. If, as is anticipated by many librarians, the retrospective catalog emphasizes holdings of the large Eastern research libraries, and these locations create a heavier inter-library loan dependence on these collections and this heavy dependence results in a charge for inter-library borrowing, the libraries in the Mountain-Plains region will be even more interested in locating items in their own region than they now are.

Relieving the Center staff of manual filing and searching and processing of requests will free them for the tasks of producing the new machine readable data banks of major resources within each state and their regional cumulation, and for becoming a service center for state libraries in the region, and for producing the various bibliographical tools as suggested in the chapter on activities, and for other special services to the libraries of all types in the region.

Within this framework, the immediate financial structure would again be an interim structure, perhaps of three years duration, to enable the Center to buy time to convert its catalogs and develop new services.

Considering the eight states of the Mountain-Plains Library Association as the basic region, and the present 11 states using the Center heavily as the potential region, and considering that only state libraries contracting for service to all libraries in the region are eligible for membership, fees might be assesed on the following basis:

1) Basic Membership (or Readiness to Serve) equals the 1968 cost of $25,762 plus a 10% cost-of-living increase plus $10,000 for an administrative assistant for the Director. This should be pro-rated according to the relative population of the member states.
2) A Long-Range Planning Factor--$20,000 for consultants to design systems for the new regional catalog, arrange for the converting of the old catalog and work with the state libraries in developing new services, also pro-rated by population.
3) A use factor, based upon actual transactions--Items 1 and 2 may be considered as a "drawing account" entitling the member to a basic number of locations services using the cost figures in the Maier analysis. Billing for 1970 could be based on the 1969 use.
4) Extra Charges for special services--such as verification, management of network (as for Colorado), literature searches or other services.

5) Location and other services to special and federal libraries in the region might be billed on a transaction basis at $5.00 per location. All other school, public and academic libraries in the state would be included in the state contract.

6) It would be left to the discretion of each state whether the local libraries send requests through the state library as a switching and screening center, or whether requests come directly to the Center. Extra charge might be assessedto those states which do not screen requests at the state level.

7) State libraries could make their own arrangements about either paying the cost of the contract directly from state or federal funds or recovering some cost (based on their use) from the libraries within the state.

Such a system, applied to libraries using the Center in 1968*, would be based on the following data:

States	(1960 Census) Population	% of Total Population in Region
Arizona	1,302,161	10.3
Colorado	1,753,947	13.7

States	(1960 Census) Population	% of Total Population in Region
Kansas	2,178,947	17.1
Nebraska	1,411,330	11.1
Nevada	285,278	2.2
New Mexico	951,023	7.4
North Dakota	632,446	5.0
Oklahoma	2,328,284	18.3
South Dakota	680,514	5.3
Utah	890,627	7.0
Wyoming	330,066	2.6
	12,744,287	100.0

* Texas, California, Idaho, Missouri and Iowa in this calculation are not considered part of the region.

An alternative to using the relative population of each state as a base for determining each state's basic membership would be to use each state's relative share in the Library Service and Construction Act as computed by the U.S. Office of Education. This formula is more complex, and may reflect more accurately the ability of the state to pay. Using this formula would not substantially alter the amounts in the fee schedule.

Another variation would be to divide the Research and Development budget on the basis of percentage of use.

The following schedule might result:

State	Basic Membership (-% of $48,338)	R & D (-% of 20,000)	Use in* 1968	Total Fee 1970
Arizona	$ 4,979	$2,060	365	$ 7,404
Colorado	6,622	2,740	22,749	32,111
Kansas	8,266	3,420	1,052	12,738
Nebraska	5,366	2,220	650	8,238
Nevada	1,063	440	93	1,596
New Mexico	3,577	1,480	564	5,621
North Dakota	2,417	1,000	0	3,417
Oklahoma	8,846	3,660	486	12,992
South Dakota	2,561	1,060	2,563	6,184
Utah	3,384	1,400	2,912	7,696
Wyoming	1,257	520	2,505	4,282
Totals	$ 48,338	$ 20,000	$ 33,939	$102,277

To the $102,277 projected in the above schedule would be added fees from special libraries and fees from libraries outside the region (such as Texas, California, Idaho, Iowa, etc.). As an interim budget it should enable the Center to survive during the period of conversion to new services.

Such a financial structure would require, as the Swank report recommended, a change in the structure of the governing board of the Center. The new board might be made up of one representative from each state, plus the president of the Mountain-Plains Library Association, plus the director of the Denver Public Library, plus three members elected at large from among the academic libraries of the region.

---

*In excess of 200 locations, @$1.92 ($1.75 plus 10%)

The Bibliographical Center is in effect subsidized by the Denver Public Library by space which in downtown Denver would cost $6 or $7 per square foot and by a sharing of bibliographical tools which the Director estimates would cost to duplicate between $75,000 and $100,000. The Bibliographical Center needs this subsidy now, and in the foreseeable future. It is not likely that the member libraries, almost all of which are themselves under-supported, would be able and/or willing to support the full costs of the Bibliographical Center as a completely independent agency. Until the Center finds another sponsor (such as the Federation of Rocky Mountain States) discussion of moving from the Denver Public Library is rhetorical.

However, as the Center moves into new service patterns, it will need to relate to an agency which can provide it with shared time on a computer and some personnel competent in automated procedures. It therefore needs to be evaluating the Denver Public Library sponsor in terms of these needs, and perhaps seeking a new home, a new sponsor; perhaps the University of Colorado as has been suggested.

CHAPTER VI

OPTIONS

The Bibliographical Center has three valuable assets--the regional union catalog, a staff with exceptional bibliographical expertise, and, perhaps even more valuable than the first two, a regional organization which has withstood the test of time for more than 30 years. In this transitional period, when networks are beginning to take form, and the federal government is evidencing interest in "networks for knowledge", and the American Library Association is sponsoring with the U.S. Office of Education a major conference on networks and the National Advisory Commission has emphasized the importance of the coordination of resources, the Bibliographical Center may be on the brink of a golden opportunity to make a major contribution to American intellectual life. The following options must be considered within this frame of reference.

In summary, the Bibliographical Center has the following options:

Option 1--Continue as it is, implementing as possible the recommendations for increased efficiency as suggested by the Maier analysis and making as few changes as possible in the fee schedule. The Center has a large balance of good will and respect in the region upon which to draw. However, if it continues to lose members at the 1969 rate, and if it continues to fall behind in its maintenance of the union catalog, and if it cannot improve its turn-around time, then inevitably rising costs will bring about its natural death unless "Networks for Knowledge" or some other federal aid to regional networks becomes a reality. Under this option, barring federal action, it is the intuition of the survey team (impossible to document) that the Center has about three years to live. The advantage of this option is that it defers action, giving the whole network picture, and the action of the Library of Congress, and the state-wide reference networks time to jell.

Option 2--The Bibliographical Center can negotiate with G.K. Hall and other companies to convert the regional union catalog to a distributable form, divide what royalties it receives, and its other assets among its members, and go out of business.

All evidence detailed in the previous chapters points away from this solution. The use of the Center has never been higher, and the value of the regional union catalog has been documented in the Maier analysis. The present heavy use of the Center, plus the general concensus that the library profession is on the threshold of a breakthrough in the coordination of resources, argues that the Center should now preserve its assets of staff and organization and continue its regional catalog.

Option 3--The Bibliographical Center can attempt to become either an independent agency of Colorado state government, or a part of the Colorado State Library, or a department of the University of Colorado libraries. Such services as it may offer to the region might be done under contract. This assumes that the governor and legislature or University regents of the State of Colorado wish to absorb the Bibliographical Center, which would need to be explored.

The advantage of this option is that it would provide the Center with a direct line to State subsidy. It may well be that all bibliographical centers, as service agencies, must be subsidized--just as libraries and schools and universities and symphony orchestras cannot exist on users' fees. It can be argued that Colorado libraries make a steadily increasing use of the Center--up to 68% in the first quarter of 1969 and that regional services as they are demanded could be arranged on contract.

The disadvantages of the Center's becoming a state agency are that 1) it will not be easy to retain its regional character as the agency of one state since inter-state contracts often depend upon inter-state compact legislation, and at best are complicated to negotiate; 2) no state legislature can be expected to subsidize services provided to another state; 3) members of the Bibliographical Center in the region would lose any voice in the control of the Center; 4) as a part of the bureaucratic state organization, the Center would lose its power to respond rapidly and flexibly to changing opportunities; and 5) the Center would sacrifice its advantage as a regional organization at a time when as noted above, we may be on the brink of dramatic network development. There is no real assurance that the Center would be better supported as an agency of Colorado State government.

Option 4--The Bibliographical Center can attempt to become an agency of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States. This move has the advantages of preserving the Center's regional character and of providing a channel to the states for subsidy. At present, the Federation is not generously funded itself. Inter-governmental agencies often lead precarious existances, with low priority by appropriating bodies. The uncertain future of the Technical Services Act which helps to fund the Federation makes it unlikely that affiliation with the Federation offers an immediate solution to the Center's problems. However, the Center might well begin discussions with officers of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States to explore future possibilities.

Option 5--The Bibliographical Center might abandon, or minimize, its services to state and public libraries, and become the agent of a consortium of universities, either in Colorado, or in the region. It can be argued that the major bibliographical activity occurs in university libraries, and that before the Center began to implement the Swank recommendations, its largest single group of users were academic libraries. The disadvantages of this move are that 1) consortia are not waiting in line to adopt the Center, and 2) universities increasingly look either to their own states or to resources in the nation rather than to the region. The fact that use of the Center by academic libraries has been decreasing in proportion to use by public and state libraries tends to coroborate this fact. The

Center for Rsch. Libraries has now changed its name and scope from regional to national.

Option 6--The Bibliographical Center can retain its present status as a non-profit corporation offering bibliographical services to the region, governed and supported by its users. If the Center can provide meaningful services at a price its members can pay, this seems the best course, even though in the not-so-long run some form of federal subsidy may be necessary--and forthcoming.

In terms of **what libraries** it will serve, and what services it will offer, the Bibliographical Center also faces several choices:

Option 7--The Bibliographical Center can attempt to maintain the regional union catalog in its present form, or it can move rapidly to convert it to some distributable form. The advantage of delay **is** that the policies of the Library of Congress regarding the National Union Catalog (Retrospective) are not yet definite, and perhaps, in the next several years, locations in the Mountain-Plains area will be included in the national tool. As indicated above, the decision has been made tentatively not to include the Bibliographical Center's locations in the Retrospective NUC. Another argument for delay is that automation techniques are rapidly improving, and some better and cheaper method to convert the catalogs might be available five or ten years from now. The advantages for negotiating now with G.K. Hall and other companies to produce the catalog and distribute it widely to the Center's members have been detailed in previous chapters. If possible, the Center should retain ownership of the published catalogs, leasing them to members as a benefit of membership. The primary reasons for converting the catalogs now are 1) that they would be a better tool for expediting inter-library loan, if they could be directly consulted in local libraries, and 2) that the present antiquated methods of maintenance and searching are occupying all of the time of the staff and thus inhibiting other cooperative services which the Center might provide.

Option 8--The Bibliographical Center can continue its policy of accepting all types of libraries as members, or it can concentrate on establishing a network of state libraries and become a service center for state libraries in the region. The logic of this reorientation was presented by Dr. Swank, and detailed again in previous chapters of this report. The fact that state libraries are recognized as pivots in the partnership between the federal government and local libraries, and that legislation is now being formulated to strengthen state library agencies, and that state wide reference networks have made dramatic progress in the last three years, all add viability to this proposal. Heaviest use of the Bibliographical Center in the last few years has been in those states where the Center has contracts with the state libraries.

Option 9--After converting its present catalogs, the Bibliographical Center can begin a new regional catalog, in machine readable form or it can propose to its members that the region can no longer afford such a tool. Careful feasibility study should precede a decision. It may be that the Center should produce (with the MARC tapes) union lists of major holdings in each state which will be susceptible of cumulation for the region . It seems uncontroversial that a new regional catalog should contain only holdings of major resource libraries in each state, and that libraries contributing to the catalog receive copies of the catalogs as compensation for contributing to them. Additional copies could be supplied state libraries in accordance with their needs.

Option 10--A new regional catalog could contain only main entries as the present catalog does, or it could contain subject entries. The advantage of subject entries is that a data bank could be created that would be valuable for literature searches and bibliographies as well as for locations for inter-library loan. The question of additional value must be weighed against the additional cost.

Option 11--If the bibliographical Center elects to move in the direction of producing a variety of bibliographical tools needed in the region, it can add competence to its own staff in automated techniques, and/or it can affiliate with the Academic Processing Center at the University of Colorado. It may be possible that certain savings could be effected by cooperation with this agency.

Option 12--In long range planning the Bibliographical Center can continue its present membership of all types of libraries (as in Option 1) or concentrate on a network of state libraries, or establish additional departments to serve business and industry, as proposed in a previous chapter, and academic libraries, and school libraries. This would imply an overall administration, plus a staff performing a core of technical services, plus a special staff of experts in each type of library , working with those libraries in the area to develop needed services. It would probably be wise for the Center to develop services to one type of library and gain some competence in automated technical processes before further diversification.

CHAPTER VI

ADDITIONAL STUDIES NEEDED

The reconnaisance study has brought up to date the intensive Swank investigation. This, together with the internal management study reported by Joan Maier would seem to provide enough data for decision making on the future role of the Bibliographical Center. In the opinion of the Wayne survey team, further comprehensive study of the Center would not be productive. However, if the Trustees elect to adopt those options detailed in the previous chapter which would require a reorientation and reorganization of the Center, the following specific investigations would be necessary. These could be undertaken either by an expanded Center staff, or by specialized consultants or research agencies under contract with the Center.

1. An investigation into how best to convert the retrospective catalogs into distributable form.
2. A feasibility study about a new regional catalog.

3. A study on how a network of state libraries in the region might be established. This study should be planned with the state librarians and the Regional Program Officers of the Division of Library Programs of the U.S. Office of Education. Funding should be sought under the Higher Education Act Title II B and/or from private foundations.
4. An investigation into the bibliographical tools most needed in the region, and how these might be produced and funded.
5. An intensive investigation into all networks, local, state and regional, general and subject oriented, operating in the Mountain-Plains region, and how these relate to each other and how the Bibliographical Center can relate to them. Federal or Foundation funding should also be sought for this study as an important segment of a national survey, critically needed. Investigation into the Mountain-Plains region might be used as a pilot study for the National survey.
6. Investigation into how the Bibliographical

Center can enter into more fruitful relationships with the Library of Congress and with the Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center. The experiment of one year with the Library of Congress will provide data for the beginning of this study.

7. A study of costs and patterns of inter-library loan. The reconnaisance study has documented that little data is being gathered by libraries to use in a scientific cost analysis of inter-library loan. The Maier study has gathered some documemtation on the value of a regional catalog. This also is a study which should be national in scope. If the Association of Research Libraries gets its projected Inter-Library Loan Study funded, the Mountain-Plains region might well serve as a pilot area to be studied.

If the Trustees decide to reorient and reorganize the Bibliographical Center, their first activity must be to chart a step by step schedule which would probably extend over two or three years. Early steps to be taken would be:

1) Consultation with the whole membership.

2) A meeting with state librarians and USOE Regional Program officers to discuss the idea of a network of state libraries.
3) Promulgation of an interim fee schedule.
4) Reorganization of the Board of Trustees with appropriate constitutional revision and other legal action.
5) Recruiting of an Administrative Assistant for the Director.
6) Evaluating and implementing as possible the recommendations for efficiency in the Maier report.
7) Undertaking the studies as detailed above.

APPENDICES

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202

DEPARTMENT OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

July 29, 1969

Office of Urban Library Research

At the invitation of the Board of Trustees of the Bibliographical Center for Research, Wayne State University is conducting a study of the Center, its present services and financial structure and its future role in the light of rapidly developing networks on a regional, state and national level. We need your ideas as a member or potential user of the Center. Would you be willing to complete the following questionnaire and return one copy to me by August 25, 1969? If you cannot answer exactly, please estimate and indicate that you have done so. Use as time period your last completed fiscal year.

Genevieve M. Casey, Associate Professor
Department of Library Science
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202

1. ______________________ Name of Library ______________________ Address of Library
____

2. ______________________ Director of Library (name) ______________________ Interlibr. Loan Librarian (name)

3. ______________________ Dates of last completed fiscal year ______________________ Number of volumes in collection

4. ______________________ Total operating budget (last fiscal year) ______________________ Total materials budget (books and periodicals)

5. Number of items borrowed from other libraries in last fiscal year: ______________________

6. Number of items loaned to other libraries in last fiscal year: ______________________

7. Estimate of average number of attempts necessary to locate an item for interlibrary loan: ______________________

8. Estimate of unit cost of locating items for interlibrary loan: ______________________

9. Number of requests sent to Bibliographical Center for Research during the past year : ____________

10. Number of items borrowed from other libraries in the region during the past year : ____________

11. (To be answered only by libraries submitting cards to the Bibliographical Center Union Catalog)

    a) Number of cards sent to Center in past year: ____________

    b) Cost of supplying cards to Center in past year: ____________

    c) Estimated number of items loaned to other libraries as result of referral from the Bibliographical Center: ____________

12. What special interlibrary loan arrangements do you have with other libraries in the region:

    a) Network of state-supported colleges & universities? ____________

    b) Network of independently supported colleges and universities ? ____________

    c) Consortium of colleges and universities? ____________ within state ____________ regional

    d) State-wide reference network? ____________

    e) Local area network? (Please specify.) ____________

    f) Other? ____________

13. Do you have access to a teletype machine:

    a) For interlibrary loan? ____________

    b) For information transfer? ____________

14. Please list the union catalogs to which you contribute other than the Bibliographical Center Regional Catalog.

Name of Catalog	Percentage of Acquisitions Included
____________	____________
____________	____________
____________	____________

15. Please check the states which you consider to be naturally in your resources region.

Arizona _____
Arkansas _____
California _____
Colorado _____
Idaho _____
Iowa _____
Kansas _____
Minnesota _____
Missouri _____
Montana _____
Nebraska _____
Nevada _____
New Mexico _____
North Dakota _____
Oklahoma _____
Oregon _____
South Dakota _____
Texas _____
Utah _____
Washington _____
Other
(specify) _____

16. Please list the five libraries to which you have turned most frequently for interlibrary loan in the past year.

1. ______________________________
2. ______________________________
3. ______________________________
4. ______________________________
5. ______________________________

17. Please check the services which the Bibliographical Center should offer under an equitable fee schedule. Star those services you would be interested in receiving for your own library.

Service	Priority	
	High	Low
a) Management and operation of state-wide network (switching, referral, etc.)	______	______
b) Location of material not in your collection	______	______
c) Verification of material not in your collection	______	______
d) Union catalog of public library holdings in the state	______	______
e) Union catalog of all major holdings in the state	______	______
f) Regional union catalog	______	______
g) Union list of serials in the state	______	______
h) Union list of serials in region	______	______
i) Union catalog of microfilm holdings	______	______
j) Union catalog of technical report literature	______	______
k) Union catalog of non-book material (films, recordings, musical scores)	______	______
l) Cumulating checklist of state documents	______	______
m) Cumulating checklist of state documents in region	______	______
n) Catalog of newspaper holdings in state	______	______
o) Catalog of newspaper holdings in region	______	______
p) Linkage with national subject networks and data banks	______	______
q) Linkage with Pacific Northwest Bibliographical Center	______	______
r) Consultant services to special libraries		
a) Organization and establishment	______	______
b) SDI Services	______	______
c) Cataloging and classification	______	______

Service	Priority	
	High	Low
s) S.D.I. services or literature searches for state government		
for college and university admin. & faculty		
t) Book catalogs of individual libraries or departmental collections		
u) Training in reference for public and school librarians		
v) Leadership in developing uses for MARC tapes in region		
w) Leadership in identifying needs of the region for resources and information services		
x) Referral center to information resources in region		
y) Cooperative acquisition for storage of unique materials in region		
z) Other (Please specify.)		

18. There are a number of ways in which a bibliographical center may be financed. Which method or combination of methods would you favor for the Bibliographical Center:

1) An umbrella fee schedule by which basic membership in the Center is negotiated for all libraries within a state?

2) Individual membership based on a proportion of the library's budget?

3) Basic fee entitling member to a drawing account on X number of transactions, with periodic billing for additional services?

4) Reorganization of the Center as a state agency with contracts for users outside the state?

5) Reorganization of the Center as an agency serving a consortium of universities, with provision for services on a transaction basis to other users?

6) A basic membership fee plus additional charges based upon levels and varieties of services?

7) Other?

19. Do you favor the expansion of the Bibliographical Center to meet the growing information needs of the region?

    Yes _____ Why? ______________________________

    ____

    ____

    No ________

20. As a member of the Bibliographical Center, do you feel that you have sufficient representation in determining the policies of the Center? Yes______ No ______

    If no, please comment: ______________________________

    ____

    ____

21. If you are not presently a member of the Bibliographical Center, what services would lead you to join?

    ____

    ____

    ____

    ____

22. If you have ideas about the future role of the Bibliographical Center not suggested in the questions above, please indicate:

    ____

    ____

    ____

    ____

===

MEMBERS AND POTENTIAL USERS OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER BY STATE TO WHICH QUESTIONNAIRE WAS SENT

Arizona

*Arizona Library Extension Service	Phoenix, Arizona
Arizona State University	Tempe, Arizona
*Phoenix Public Library	Phoenix, Arizona
*University of Arizona	Tucson, Arizona

Colorado

Adams State College	Alamosa, Colorado
Arvada Public Library	Arvada, Colorado
Boulder Public Library	Boulder, Colorado
Climax Molybdenum Company	Climax, Colorado
Colorado College	Colorado Springs, Colo.
*Colorado School of Mines	Golden, Colorado
Colorado State College	Greeley, Colorado
*Colorado State Historical Society	Denver, Colorado
*Colorado State Library	Denver, Colorado
*Colorado State University	Fort Collins, Colorado
Denver Medical Society Library	Denver, Colorado
*Denver Public Library	Denver, Colorado
Dow Chemical, Rocky Flats Plant	Golden, Colorado
*Durango Public Library	Durango, Colorado
*ESSA Research Laboratories	Boulder, Colorado
*Fort Logan Mental Health Center	Denver, Colorado
Garfield County Public	New Castle, Colorado
Iliff School of Theology	Denver, Colorado
*International Business Machines Corporation	Boulder, Colorado
*Jefferson County Public Library	Golden, Colorado
Kaman Aircraft Corporation	Colorado Springs, Colo.
*Marathon Oil Company	Littleton, Colo.
*Mesa College	Grand Junction, Colo.
Metropolitan State College	Denver, Colorado
Molybdenum Corporation of America	Louviers, Colorado
Montrose County Regional Library	Montrose, Colorado
*National Center for Atmospheric Research	Boulder, Colorado
*Pikes Peak Regional District Library	Colorado Springs, Colo.
Pueblo Regional Library	Pueblo, Colorado
Regis College	Denver, Colorado
Southern Colorado State College	Pueblo, Colorado
St. Thomas Seminary Library	Denver, Colorado
S. E. Metropolitan Information Center	Denver, Colorado
*Temple Buell College	Denver, Colorado
*University of Colorado	Boulder, Colorado
*University of Colorado Medical Center	Denver, Colorado
Fort Lewis College	Durango, Colorado

*Indicates responding libraries

Colorado Libraries cont.

*University of Denver	Denver, Colorado
U.S. Air Force Academy	A.F.B., Colorado
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Denver, Colorado
*U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	Denver, Colorado
U.S. Geological Survey Library	Denver, Colorado
U.S. Army Medical Research and Nutrition	Denver, Colorado
U.S. Veterans Administration Hospital	Denver, Colorado
*Weld County Library	Greeley, Colorado
Western State College	Gunnison, Colorado
Mesa County Public Library	Grand Junction, Colorado

Idaho

Idaho Nuclear Corporation	Idaho Falls, Idaho

Iowa

*Ottumwa Public Library	Ottumwa, Iowa

Kansas

*Fort Hays Kansas State College	Hays, Kansas
*Hutchinson Public Library	Hutchinson, Kansas
*Kansas State College of Pittsburg	Pittsburg, Kansas
Kansas State Teacher's College	Emporia, Kansas
Kansas State University	Manhattan, Kansas
Kansas Wesleyan University	Salina, Kansas
McPherson College	McPherson, Kansas
*Salina Public Library	Salina, Kansas
*State Libraries of Kansas	Topeka, Kansas
Sterling College	Sterling, Kansas
Topeka Public Library	Topeka, Kansas
*University of Kansas Libraries	Lawrence, Kansas
Wichita City Library	Wichita, Kansas
*Wichita State University	Wichita, Kansas

Missouri

Kansas City Public Library	Kansas City, Missouri
*Mid-Continent Public Library Service	Independence, Missouri

Nebraska

Creighton University	Omaha, Nebraska
Lincoln Public Library	Lincoln, Nebraska
Chadron State College	Chadron, Nebraska
*Hiram Scott College Library	Scottsbluff, Nebr.
Lincoln Public Library	Lincoln, Nebraska
Nebraska Public Library Commission	Lincoln, Nebraska
Omaha Public Library	Omaha, Nebraska
Hastings College	Hastings, Nebraska

*Indicates responding libraries

Nebraska cont.

University of Nebraska	Lincoln, Nebraska
University of Nebraska at Omaha	Omaha, Nebraska

Nevada

Nevada State Library	Carson City, Nevada

New Mexico

*Albuquerque Public Library	Albuquerque, New Mexico
*Eastern New Mexico University	Portales, New Mexico
Gallup Public Library	Gallup, New Mexico
*Mesa Public Library	Los Alamos, New Mexico
New Mexico Highlands University	Las Vegas, New Mexico
*New Mexico State Library	Santa Fe, New Mexico
*Western New Mexico University	Silver City, New Mexico

North Dakota

*North Dakota State Library Commission	Bismarck, North Dakota
*North Dakota State University	Fargo, North Dakota
*University of North Dakota	Grand Forks, N. Dakota

Oklahoma

*Oklahoma Department of Libraries	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Pan American Petroleum Corporation	Tulsa, Oklahoma

South Dakota

Black Hills State College	Spearfish, South Dakota
*South Dakota State University	Brookings, South Dakota
*Northern State College	Aberdeen, South Dakota
Pierre Carnegie Public Library	Pierre, South Dakota
Rapid City Public Library	Rapid City, South Dakota
*Sioux Falls, Carnegie Free Public Library	Sioux Falls, South Dakota
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	Rapid City, South Dakota
*South Dakota State Library Commission	Pierre, South Dakota
*University of South Dakota	Vermillion, South Dakota
Watertown Regional Library	Watertown, South Dakota

Texas

Abilene Christian College	Abilene, Texas
Amon Carter Museum of Western Art	Fort Worth, Texas
*Dallas Public Library	Dallas, Texas
General Dynamics	Fort Worth, Texas
Kemp Public Library	Wichita Falls, Texas
Rice University	Houston, Texas
*Texas Christian University	Fort Worth, Texas

*Indicates responding libraries

Texas cont.

*Texas Technological College	Lubbock, Texas
University of Texas at El Paso	El Paso, Texas

Utah

*Brigham Young University Library	Provo, Utah
U.S. Intermountain Forest & Range Exp. Station	Ogden, Utah
*University of Utah Libraries	Salt Lake City, Utah
*Utah State University	Logan, Utah
*Weber State College	Ogden, Utah

Wyoming

*Casper College Library	Casper, Wyoming
Central Wyoming College	Riverton, Wyoming
Laramie County Carnegie Public Library	Cheyenne, Wyoming
Natrona County Public Library	Casper, Wyoming
Rock Springs Public Library	Rock Springs, Wyom.
*Sheridan College	Sheridan, Wyoming
*Sheridan County Library	Sheridan, Wyoming
*University of Wyoming	Laramie, Wyoming
*Wyoming State Library	Cheyenne, Wyoming

*Indicates responding libraries

MEMBERS AND POTENTIAL USERS OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER BY TYPE OF LIBRARY TO WHICH QUESTIONNAIRE WAS SENT

College and University Libraries

Abilene Christian College	Abilene, Texas
Adams State College	Alamosa, Colorado
Arizona State University	Tempe, Arizona
Black Hills State College	Spearfish, South Dakota
*Brigham Young University	Provo, Utah
*Casper College	Casper, Wyoming
Central Wyoming College	Riverton, Wyoming
Chadron State College	Chadron, Nebraska
Colorado College	Colorado Springs, Colo.
*Colorado School of Mines	Golden, Colorado
Colorado State College	Greeley, Colorado
*Colorado State University	Fort Collins, Colorado
Creighton University	Omaha, Nebraska
*Eastern New Mexico University	Portales, New Mexico
*Fort Hays Kansas State College	Hays, Kansas
Hastings College	Hastings, Nebraska
*Hiram Scott College	Scottsbluff, Nebraska
*Kansas State College of Pittsburg	Pittsburg , Kansas
Kansas State Teacher's College	Emporia, Kansas
Kansas State University	Manhattan, Kansas
Kansas Wesleyan University	Salina, Kansas
Metropolitan State College	Denver, Colorado
New Mexico Highlands University	Las Vegas, New Mexico
*Mesa College	Grand Junction, Colorado
*North Dakota State University	Fargo, North Dakota
*Northern State College	Aberdeen South Dakota
Regis College	Denver, Colorado
Rice University	Houston, Texas
*Sheridan College	Sheridan, Wyoming
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	Rapid City, South Dakota
*South Dakota State University	Brookings, South Dakota
Southern Colorado State College	Pueblo, Colorado
Sterling College	Sterling, Kansas
McPherson College	McPherson, Kansas
*Temple Buell College	Denver, Colorado
*Texas Christian University	Fort Worth, Texas
*Texas Technological College	Lubbock, Texas
U.S. Air Force Academy	Colorado
*University of Arizona	Tucson, Arizona
*University of Colorado	Boulder, Colorado

*Indicates responding libraries.

College and University Libraries cont.

*University of Denver	Denver, Colorado
*University of Kansas	Lawrence, Kansas
University of Nebraska	Lincoln, Nebraska
University of Nebraska at Omaha	Omaha, Nebraska
*University of North Dakota	Grand Forks, North Dakota
*University of South Dakota	Vermillion, South Dakota
University of Texas at El Paso	El Paso, Texas
*University of Utah	Salt Lake City, Utah
*University of Wyoming	Laramie, Wyoming
*Utah State University	Logan, Utah
*Weber State College	Ogden, Utah
*Western New Mexico University	Silver City, New Mexiso
Western State College	Gunnison, Colorado
*Wichita State University	Wichita, Kansas
Fort Lewis College	Durango, Colorado

Public Libraries

*Albuquerque Public Library	Albuquerque, New Mexico
Arvada Public Library	Arvada, Colorado
Bennett Martin Public Library	Lincoln, Nebraska
Boulder Public Library	Boulder, Colorado
*Dallas Public Library	Dallas, Texas
*Denver Public Library	Denver, Colorado
*Durango Public Library	Durango, Colorado
Gallup Public Library	Gallup, New Mexico
Garfield County Public Library	New Castle, Colorado
*Hutchinson Public Library	Hutchinson, Kansas
*Jefferson County Public Library	Golden, Colorado
Kansas City Public Library	Kansas City, Missouri
Laramie County Library System	Cheyenne, Wyoming
Kemp Public Library	Wichita Falls, Texas
Mesa County Public Library	Grand Junction, Colorado
*Mesa Public Library	Los Alamos, New Mexico
Natrona County Public Library	Casper, Wyoming
Omaha Public Library	Omaha, Nebraska
*Ottumwa Public Library	Ottumwa, Iowa
Montrose County Regional Library	Montrose, Colorado
*Phoenix Public Library	Phoenix, Arizona
Pierre Carnegie Public Library	Pierre, South Dakota
*Pikes Peak Regional District Library	Colorado Springs, Colorado
Pueblo Regional Library	Pueblo, Colorado
Rapid City Public Library	Rapid City, South Dakota
Rock Springs Public Library	Rock Springs, Wyoming
*Salina Public Library	Salina, Kansas
*Sheridan County Library	Sheridan, Wyoming
*Sioux Falls Carnegie Free Public Library	Sioux Falls, South Dakota
Topeka Public Library	Topeka, Kansas
Watertown Regional Library	Watertown, South Dakota
*Weld County Library	Greeley, Colorado
Wichita City Library	Wichita, Kansas

*Indicates responding libraries

State Libraries

*Arizona Department of Library and Archives	Phoenix, Arizona
*Colorado State Library	Denver, Colorado
*State Libraries of Kansas	Topeka, Kansas
Nebraska Public Library Commission	Lincoln, Nebraska
Nevada State Library	Carson City, Nevada
*New Mexico State Library	Santa Fe, New Mexico
*North Dakota State Library Commission	Bismarck, North Dakota
*Oklahoma Department of Libraries	Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
*South Dakota State Library Commission	Pierre, South Dakota
*Wyoming State Library	Cheyenne, Wyoming

Special Libraries

Amon Carter Museum of Western Art	Fort Worth, Texas
Climax Molybdenum Company	Climax, Colorado
*Colorado State Historical Society	Denver, Colorado
Denver Medical Society	Denver, Colorado
Dow Chemical, Rocky Flats Plant	Golden, Colorado
*ESSA Research Laboratories	Boulder, Colorado
General Dynamics Fort Worth Division	Fort Worth, Texas
*Fort Logan Mental Health Center	Denver, Colorado
Iliff School of Theology	Denver, Colorado
Idaho Nuclear Corporation	Idaho Falls, Idaho
*IBM Systems Manufacturing Division	Boulder, Colorado
Kaman Aircraft Corporation, Nuclear Division	Colorado Springs, Colorado
*Marathon Oil Research Center	Littleton, Colorado
*Mid-Continent Public Library Service	Independence, Missouri
Molybdenum Corporation of America	Louviers, Colorado
*National Center for Atmospheric Research	Boulder, Colorado
Pan American Petroleum Corporation	Tulsa, Oklahoma
St. Thomas Seminary	Denver, Colorado
South-East Metropolitan Board of Cooperative Services Professional Information Center	Denver, , Colorado
U.S. Army Medical Research and Nutrition Laboratory	Denver, Colorado
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Denver, Colorado
*U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wild Life	Denver, Colorado
U.S. Geological Survey	Denver, Colorado
U.S. Intermountain Forest & Range Experiment Station	Ogden, Utah
U.S. Veterans Administration Hospital	Denver, Colorado
*University of Colorado Medical Center	Denver, Colorado

*Indicates responding libraries

LIBRARIES CONTRIBUTING TO THE REGIONAL UNION CATALOG, JULY 1969

Libraries	Cards Contributed, Last Fiscal Year
Arizona	
Arizona State University, Tempe (1966-1968 only)	88,650 (Jan-Aug 1968)
Phoenix Public Library, Phoenix	9,905
University of Arizona Library, Tucson	37,150
Colorado	
Adams State College, Alamosa	4,350
Colorado College, Tutt Library, Colorado Springs	7,100
Colorado School of Mines Library, Golden (except fiction)	2,175
Colorado State College Library, Greeley (LC cards only)	4,350
Colorado State Library, Denver (Adult non-fic.)	1,695
Colorado State Library, Western Slope Branch, Grand Junction	1,475
Colorado State University Library, Fort Collins	37,100
Denver Medical Society Library, Denver	286
Denver Public Library, Denver	10,285
(plus 11,077 from official S.L.)	+11,077
Denver Public Schools Professional Library, Denver	400
Fort Lewis College, Durango	
Fort Logan Mental Health Center Library, Denver	1,975
Iliff School of Theology Library, Denver	6,360
Loretto Heights College Library, Loretto	300
Marathon Oil Company, Research Center Lib., Littleton	1,028
Mesa College Library, Grand Junction	4,720
Mesa County Public Library, Grand Junction	2,350
Metropolitan State College, Denver	4,670
Pikes Peak Regional District Library, Colorado Springs (non-fiction)	6,450
Pueblo Regional Library, Pueblo	7,000
Regis College Library, Denver (90%)	5,400
S.E. Metropolitan Bd. of Coop. Services, Professional Information Center, Denver	146
St. Thomas Seminary, Denver	13,000
University of Colorado Libraries, Boulder	43,100
University of Colorado Medical Cen. Lib., Denver	670
University of Denver, Mary Reed Lib., Denver	15,000
U. S. Air Force Academy Library	9,200
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Library, Denver	7,050
U.S. Environmental Science Services Adm., Boulder	975

Libraries	Cards Contributed, Last Fiscal Year
U.S. Geological Survey Library, Denver Branch	1,235
U.S. Veterans Administration, Medical Library, Denver	
Weld County Library, Greeley	2,700
Western State College Library, Gunnison	5,850
Iowa	
Ottumwa Public Library (Iowa materials)	100
Kansas	
Kansas State University Library, Manhattan (to June 1968)	30,750
Kansas Wesleyan University Library, Salina	1,350
St. Mary College, Xavier (rare books coll.)	150
State Libraries of Kansas, Topeka	350
Topeka Free Public Library	8,046
University of Kansas Library, Lawrence	24,150
University of Kansas School of Medicine Library, Kansas City	
Missouri	
Kansas City Public Library (partial)	5,740
Linda Hall Library, Kansas City	7,150
Mid-Continent Public Library Service, Independence	
Nebraska	
None; however, the Nebraska Union Catalog is linked with the Center by TWX	
Nevada	
Nevada State Library, Carson City (Nevada & gambling)	22
New Mexico	
Albuquerque Public Library	7,700
New Mexico Highlands University Library, Las Vegas	1,950
New Mexico State Library, Santa Fe	875
University of New Mexico Library, Albuquerque	29,896
North Dakota	
North Dakota Public Library Commission, Bismarck (N.Dak. materials)	35
The Bib. Center also queries the North Dakota Union Catalog.	

Libraries	Cards Contributed, Last Fiscal Year
Oklahoma	
Oklahoma Department of Libraries, Oklahoma City	
South Dakota	
Augustana College, Sioux Falls (Norwegian collection)	
Black Hills State College Library, Spearfish	5,523
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell	
Homestake Mining Company, Lead (foreign language; gold mining; S. Dak. history)	
Hot Springs Public Library (state and local history)	
Northern State College, Aberdeen	1,550
Rapid City Public Library (state and local history)	
Sioux Falls Carnegie Free Library, Sioux Falls	
Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls	
South Dakota State Library Commission, Pierre	6,165
South Dakota State School of Mining and Technology, Rapid City	3,250
South Dakota State University Library, Brookings	16,993
University of South Dakota, Vermillion	
Watertown Regional Library (state and local history)	
Texas	
Abilene Christian College, Abilene	1,500
Texas Technological College Library, Lubbock	44,400
University of Texas at El Paso (Latin Amer. Coll.)	315
Utah	
Brigham Young University Library, Provo	58,750
University of Utah Library, Salt Lake City	27,100
Utah State University Library, Logan	8,900
Wyoming	
Albany County Library, Laramie (state and local history)	
Converse County Library, Douglas (state and local history)	
Fort Laramie National Historical Monument	
Laramie County Library System, Cheyenne	3,350
Sheridan College, Sheridan	1,050
University of Wyoming Library, Laramie	18,925
Wyoming State Library, Cheyenne	5,575
In addition, cards for science and technology titles, John Crerar Library are purchased	(4,635)

TABLE 1

INTERLIBRARY LOAN REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CENTER, BY STATE, 1964 - 1968

State	1964		1968		Percentage of Growth or Decrease
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	
Arizona	740	6.4	389	1.8	- 4.4
California	51	0.4	1	--	- 0.4
Colorado	5,788	50.0	11,987	57.3	+ 7.3
Idaho	--	--	18	0.5	+ 0.5
Iowa	--	--	114	0.5	+ 0.5
Kansas	1,093	9.4	745	3.5	- 5.9
Minnesota	--	--	--	--	--
Missouri	66	0.6	48	0.2	- 0.4
Nebraska	67	0.6	537	2.6	+ 2.0
Nevada	119	1.0	248	1.2	+ 0.2
New Mexico	330	2.8	492	2.6	- 0.2
North Dakota	86	0.7	162	0.8	+ 0.1
Oklahoma	6	--	452	2.2	+ 2.2
South Dakota	642	5.5	1,528	7.3	+ 1.8
Texas	913	7.9	938	4.5	- 3.4
Utah	1,018	8.9	1,709	8.2	- 0.2
Wyoming	667	5.8	1,495	7.2	+ 1.4
Totals	11,586	100.0	20,866	100.0	

TABLE 2

INTERLIBRARY LOAN REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CENTER, BY TYPE OF LIBRARY 1964, 1968

Type of Library	1964		1968		Percentage of Growth or Decrease
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	
Academic	6,653	57%	9,112	44%	-13%
Public	3,346	29%	8,387	40%	+11%
State	653	6%	2,602	12%	+ 6%
*Special	907	8%	682	3%	- 5%
Other	27	Less than 1%	83	1%	+ 1%

*Includes special libraries

TABLE 3

INTERLIBRARY LOAN REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CENTER, BY STATE, FIRST QUARTER, 1968, 1969

State	January to April, 1968		January to April, 1969		Percentage of Growth or Decrease
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	
Arizona	173	2.5	110	0.9	-1.6
California	1	--	0	--	--
Colorado	3,726	53.8	8,128	68.3	+14.5
Idaho	12	0.2	--	--	-0.2
Iowa	5	0.1	85	0.7	+0.6
Kansas	408	5.9	65	0.5	-5.4
Missouri	21	0.3	9	0.1	-0.2
Nebraska	196	2.8	187	1.6	-1.2
Nevada	119	1.7	62	0.5	-1.2
New Mexico	172	2.5	229	1.9	-0.6
North Dakota	44	0.6	133	1.0	+0.4
Oklahoma	10	0.1	283	2.4	+2.3
South Dakota	632	9.1	861	7.2	-1.9
Texas	332	4.8	322	2.7	-2.1
Utah	553	8.0	779	6.5	-1.5
Wyoming	522	7.5	683	5.7	-1.8
Totals	6,926	99.8	11,926	100.0	

TABLE 4

INTERLIBRARY LOAN REQUESTS SUBMITTED TO CENTER, BY TYPE OF LIBRARY
FIRST QUARTER, 1968, 1969

	January - April, 1968		January - April, 1969		
	Number	Percentage of Total	Number	Percentage of Total	Percentage of Growth or Decrease
Academic	3,458	49.9	4,102	33.2	-16.7
Public	2,125	30.7	6,680	55.4	+14.7
State Library	1,023	14.8	916	7.6	- 7.2
Special	293*	4.2	189*	1.6	- 2.6
Other	27	0.4	271	2.2	+ 1.8
Totals	6,926	100.0	12,068**	100.0	

*Includes federal libraries

** Note: Slight discrepancy in figures provided for totals by state, preceding chart

TABLE 5

COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERLIBRARY LOAN

Library	State-Wide Reference Network	Other
PUBLIC		
Albuquerque, N.Mex.	yes	S.W. Union List of Serials plus informal arrangement with other libraries
Dallas, Texas	yes	
Denver, Colo.	yes	Central Colorado Public Library System; Courier Service--College and government libraries
Durango, Colo.	-	
Hutchinson, Kan.	yes	
Los Alamos, N.Mex.	-	Direct distance dialing to locate items in immediate area
Jefferson Co. Colo.	yes	Denver Metro System
Ottumwa, Iowa	yes begin 10/69	Iowa Cooperative System
Phoenix, Ariz.	-	Special Loan Arrangements with State Library (in same city)
Pikes Peak Regional Colo.	yes	Bibliographical Center
Salina, Kansas	yes	Central Kansas Library System
Sheridan Co. Wyo.	yes	WICHE Health Services Network
Sioux Falls, S.Dak.	yes	
Weld County, Colo.	yes	Weld County Library System & High Plains P. L. System
STATE		
Arizona State Lib.	yes	TWX project with two universities
Colorado State Lib.	yes	Direct loan to public and institutional libraries of special subject collections unavailable elsewhere
Kansas State Lib.	yes	1) Seven Regional Library Systems 2) Network-state supported colleges and universities 3) Consortium of colleges and universities with state.
New Mex. State Lib.	yes	Regional consortium of colleges and universities
N. Dakota Lib. Commission	yes	
Oklahoma Dept. of Libraries	yes-(OTIS)	
S. Dakota Lib. Commission	-	1) Consortium of colleges and universities within state 2) State Union card Catalog (colleges and universities)

TABLE 5--(cont.)

COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INTERLIBRARY LOAN

Library	Network-State Supported Colleges and Universities	Network Independently Supported Colleges and Universities	Consortium of Colleges and Universities	State Wide Reference Network	Other
ACADEMIC					
Brigham Young Univ.	0	0	0	yes	
Casper College	-	-	-	-	
Colorado School of Mines	-	-	Regional	yes	Courier service with academic and special libraries with radius of 75-100 miles
Colorado State Univ.	-	-	Regional	yes	ILL Courier Service involving some academic and federal libraries on Eastern slope, Denver P.L. and Bibliographical Center.
Eastern N.Mex. Univ.	-	-	Regional	yes	
Fort Hays State Coll.	-	-	-	-	
Fort Lewis College	-	-	State	-	
Hiram Scott College	-	-	-	yes	Public Library Commission union catalog.
Kansas State College	-	-	-	-	S.E.K. Regional - Public Libraries
Mesa College	-	-	-	yes	
N. Dak. State Univ.	-	-	Regional	yes	Tri-college university - open borrowing for all students.
Northern State College	yes	yes	State and Regional	yes	Two local colleges and one public library
Sheridan College	-	-	-	yes	Wyoming State Library
S. Dak. State Univ.	-	-	State	-	
Temple Buell College	-	Colorado Assoc. Independent colleges and regional insts.	-	yes	

TABLE 5 (cont.)

Library	Network-State Supported Colleges and Universities	Network Independently Supported Colleges and Universities	Consortium of Colleges and Universities	State Wide Reference Network	Other
Texas Christian Univ.	yes teletype	-	State teletype	26 State-supported institutions and major public libs.	8 colleges and univs. in Dallas-Ft. Worth area linked by teletype
Texas Tech. College	yes	-	Regional	yes	
Univ. of Arizona	yes	yes	Hoover Consortium	-	
Univ. of Colorado	-	-	Western U. & Colleges	Yes, TWX	Cooperation with Public Lib. Courier Service with Academic, Public, & Special Libs. within 75-100 mile radius.
Univ. of Denver	yes	yes	State	-	Metro-Denver-Boulder Courier-WAT Service for emergency uses, nation-wide
Univ. of Kansas	Courier Svc. twice weekly to Kansas St. Colleges & Universities	-	-	-	Kansas Information Circuit - Center for Research Libraries
Univ. of N.Dak.	yes	-	-	-	
Univ. of S.Dak.	yes	-	Stanford Hoover Consortium	yes	S.Dakota Union List of Serials
Utah State Univ.	Yes TWX	TWX with independently supported	-	-	Denver Bib.
Western N.Mex. Univ.	-	-	Regional	-	
Wichita State Univ.	yes	-	-	-	
Weber College	yes	yes	-	yes	WATS line to handicapped residents, school and public libraries
Univ. of Wyo.	yes	-	-	yes	

TABLE 6

UNION CATALOGS TO WHICH LIBRARIES IN REGION CONTRIBUTE
(In Addition to Bibliographical Center Regional Catalog)

Library	National Union Catalog	State Union Lists	Union List of Serials	National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections	Other
ACADEMIC					
Brigham Young Univ.			100%	100%	New Serial Titles -- Newspapers on Microfilm 100%
Colorado School of Mines					
Colorado State University	24%				
Kansas State College, Pittsburg					
N.Dak.State Univ.		100%			
Northern State Coll. Aberdeen, S.Dak.					
S. Dakota State U.					
Texas Christian Univ.					Texas List--Scientific Tech. Serials; Regional List of Newspapers
Texas Tech. Coll.	15%				University of Texas
University of Colo.					
Univ. of Kansas	100% Catalog Titles				
Univ. S. Dakota					
Univ. Utah	50% (est.)				
Utah State Univ.			100%		New Serial Titles(100%)
Weber State Coll.					
Western New Mex. U.					Southwestern - 20%
PUBLIC					
Albuquerque					Southwestern Univ. List of Serials 100%
Denver					NST - 100% new and changed

TABLE 6 --(cont.)

Library	National Union Catalog	State Union Lists	Union List of Serials	National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections	Other
PUBLIC--(cont.)					
Ottumwa		100o/o			
Phoenix		Union List of Serials 100o/o			
Sioux Falls		Union List of Serials 90 o/o			
SPECIAL					
ESSA	60o/o				
IBM Boulder					Company Network 100 o/o
National Center for Atmospheric Research					Serials Catalog with ESSA and University of Denver Science Library
Colorado State Historical Society				25 o/o	Newspapers on Microfilm, 100 o/o
STATE					
Arizona State Lib.			75 o/o		Intermountain Union Listing of periodicals 100 o/o

TABLE 7

SERVICES BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER SHOULD PROVIDE LIBRARIES

Service	Interested in Receiving	High Priority	Low Priority
Management of State Wide Network	2 Public	7 Academic 4 Public 3 Special	11 Academic 3 Public 3 State 1 Special
Location for Inter-Library Loan	10 Academic 4 Public 6 State 2 Special	13 Academic 8 Public 2 State 4 Special	2 Academic
Verification	1 Academic 1 Public 3 State 2 Special	8 Academic 5 Public 2 Special	11 Academic 4 Public 2 State 2 Special
Union Catalog of Public Library Collections in State	2 Public 2 State	5 Academic 2 Public 1 State 1 Special	15 Academic 2 State 4 Public 3 Special
Union Catalog of All Holdings in State	1 Academic 3 Public 2 State	12 Academic 6 Public 2 State 3 Special	8 Academic 2 Public 2 State 2 Special
Regional Union Catalog	4 Academic 2 Public 1 Special 1 State	16 Academic 8 Public 3 Special	3 Academic 3 State 1 Public 2 Special
Union List of Serials in State	1 Academic 1 Special	9 Academic 3 Public 2 State 4 Special	10 Academic 5 Public 1 State 2 Special
Union List of Serials in Region	1 Academic 1 Public 2 Special	17 Academic 6 Public 4 State 4 Special	6 Academic 3 Public 1 Special

TABLE 7 --(cont.)

Service	Interested in Receiving	High Priority	Low Priority
Union Catalog Microfilm Holdings	2 Academic 3 Public 1 State	11 Academic 2 Public 2 State 3 Special	8 Academic 7 Public 1 State 3 Special
Union Catalog - Technical Report Literature	1 State 2 Special	8 Academic 2 Public 2 State 2 Special	14 Academic 5 Public 2 State 2 Special
Union Catalog Non-book Materials	3 Academic 1 Public 1 State	3 Academic 2 Public 1 State 1 Special	14 Academic 6 Public 3 State 4 Special
Cumulating Checklist of State Documents	1 State	8 Academic 3 Public 1 Special	11 Academic 6 Public 3 State 1 Special
Cumulating Checklist of State Documents in Region	1 Academic 2 Public	10 Academic 4 Public 3 State	11 Academic 4 Public 2 State 4 Special
Catalog of Newspaper Holdings in State	1 Academic 2 Public	5 Academic 2 State	13 Academic 6 Public 3 State 4 Special
Catalog of Newspaper Holdings in Region	1 Academic 2 Public	9 Academic 2 Public 4 State	10 Academic 5 Public 1 State 4 Special
Linkage - National Subject Network and Data Books	1 Academic 4 Public 1 Special	14 Academic 5 Public 3 State 1 Special	6 Academic 1 State 4 Special
Linkage - Pacific N.W. Bibliographical Center	2 Public 1 State	15 Academic 3 Public 2 State 13 Special	7 Academic 4 Public 2 State 2 Special

TABLE 7 --(cont.)

Service	Interested in Receiving	High Priority	Low Priority
Consultant Services to Special Libraries		2 Academic 1 State	17 Academic 6 Public 3 State 2 Special
a) Organization and Establishment	1 Special		
b) S. D. I Services	1 Special	2 Academic	16 Academic 5 Public 2 Special 2 State
c) Cataloging and Classification	1 Special	3 Academic	15 Academic 5 Public 3 State 3 Special
S.D.I. Services or Literature Search		1 Special 3 State 4 Academic	2 Special 2 State 8 Public 15 Academic
a) For State Government	1 State		1 State
b) For Academic Administration and Faculty		8 Academic 1 State	11 Academic 7 Public 3 State 3 Special
Book Catalogs of Individual Libraries or Departmental Collections		5 Academic	15 Academic 7 Public 5 State 3 Special
Leadership in Developing Uses for MARC Tapes in Region	2 Public	10 Academic 4 Public 3 State 3 Special	10 Academic 4 Public 3 State 2 Special

TABLE 7 --(cont.)

Service	Interested in Receiving	High Priority	Low Priority
Leadership in Identifying Need of Region for Resourse and Information Services	4 Public	17 Academic 3 Public 2 State 4 Special	4 Academic 1 Public 1 State 2 Special
Referral Center to Information Resources of Region	1 Academic 4 Public 1 State	18 Academic 5 Public 4 State 3 Special	2 Academic 3 Public 3 Special
Coop. Acquisition for Storage of Library Materials in Region	3 Public 1 Special	17 Academic 4 Public 2 State 3 Special	5 Academic 13 Public 4 State 2 Special

Other:

Communication to Individual Libraries about Bibliographic Center Services (high)

Compilation of Special Subject Bibliography*

Reference Type Service for Subject Requests (high)

Production of Bibliographies as needed (high)

A Telephone Service (rather than mail) Sensitive to Rush Requests*

Act as Operator for Telefacsimile Reproduction Service from Linda Hall, John Crerar, etcetera.

TABLE 8

ATTITUDES TOWARD EXPANSION OF BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER
ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Libraries	Favor Expansion	Reason	Have Sufficient Representatives on Policies	Comment
Brigham Young Univ.	yes	Best organized, located & equipped to handle growing information needs of region.	yes	
Casper College	yes	Needs are expanding	yes	
Colorado School of Mines	yes	With expansion, service should improve	yes	Provision should be made for more frequent and direct participation by members determining broad policies of Center
Colo.St. Univ.	yes			
Eastern N.Mex.	yes	Some agency is needed to avoid duplication	no	
Ft.Hays, Kan.	yes	Who else?	yes	
Ft.Lewis, Colo.	yes	Information demands will increase--serving more people in a wider area, should reduce cost and provide better service	yes	
Hiram Scott				
Kansas State Pittsburg	yes		yes	
Mesa College	no	Not without adequate, long-range financial support	yes	
N. Dak. State University	yes	Bib Center must assume leadership in information linkage and switching systems in region or some other agency will accept the responsibility	yes	
Northern State S. Dak.	yes	Knowledge is increasing so fast that institutions cannot rely only on their own resources	yes	
Sheridan Coll.	yes	Duplication is costly and sometimes impossible centralization of resource is vital	yes	
S.Dak. State University	yes	Necessary for verification and location of materials		

TABLE 8 --(Cont.)

Libraries	Favor Expansion	Reason	Have Sufficient Representatives on Policies	Comment
Temple Buell College	yes	Logical development of Bibliographical Center use and capability	yes	
Texas Christian				
Texas Techno-logical Coll.	yes	It is a sound foundation upon which to build	no	Is closely held & controlled opr. because of geography
Univ.of Arizona	yes	To refer requests to known sources and to provide information and services not now available in region	yes	
Univ.of Denver	yes	Increased volume of use without increased personnel at Bib. Center has resulted in considerable delay	yes	
Univ. S.Dak.	yes	Post service has been excellent	yes	
Univ. N. Dak.	yes	To become part of a national network	?	
Univ. of Utah	yes		yes	
Utah State University	yes	To act as central stores for new difficult material or difficult to acquire material	yes	
Western N.Mex.	no		yes	
Wichita State U.	no	As now constituted, Bibliographical Center is anachronism! Kansas must solve its own library problems	yes	
Univ. of Colo.	-		-	Largest Library should be on Board at all times
		PUBLIC LIBRARIES		
Albuquerque	yes	To meet all regional bibliographical needs beyond state level and to serve as link with national resources	no	May be due to lack of initiative on our part
Denver	yes	Cooperative purchasing and location gets more for all	yes	
Durango	no		no	Individual libraries are not consulted on major policies
Hutchinson	yes	Public libraries and system centers cannot afford or attract personnel needed to meet growing sophistication and number of demands		
Jefferson Co.	Yes	To tie in with other Regional networks	yes	

TABLE 8 --(Cont.)

Libraries	Favor Expansion	Reason	Have Sufficient Representatives on Policies	Comment
Los Alamos				
Ottumwa	yes			
Phoenix	yes	It would be a tremendous time saver to locate all types of reference material in a region through a single agency	no	Members should be actively involved in operational plans of Center
Pikes Peak Regional	yes	Build on strength of organization presently in operation	no	Lack of communication from Bd. of Bibliographical Center
Salina	no	Not without serious study instead of past and present efforts to "save Bib Center" without real justification	yes	
Sheridan Co.	yes	If expansion means refining and upgrading service,Center is absolute necessity since many libraries of the region have very limited resources and are in need of ILL.	no	Members should be supplied with an evaluation of filling of requests by the Bib Center
Sioux Falls	yes	No library is able to meet all requests of an informed and diversified public	yes	
Weld Co.	yes	Expansion (into new services) would be to our advantage in improving service to patrons	yes	
		STATE LIBRARIES		
Colorado	yes	State's information needs are increasing. Bib Center has the best equipment and staff with which to build.	no	Board structure should be reviewed
Kansas	yes	State libraries need to form a systems to perform those functions 1) they cannot do individually and 2) what they can cooperatively do better and cheaper. Bib Center could be center of this system	yes	Under present scope of Center
New Mexico	no		yes	

TABLE 8 --(cont.)

Libraries STATE (Cont.)	Favor Expansion	Reason	Have Sufficient Representatives on Policies	Comment
North Dakota	yes	Broader selection of material inevitably needed as requests get more sophisticated	yes	
Oklahoma	yes	Regional development is the future trend if the Bib Center exists	yes	
South Dakota			yes	
Wyoming	yes		yes	
Arizona	yes		yes	
		SPECIAL LIBRARIES		
ESSA	yes		yes	
Fort Logan Mental Health Center	yes	Information resources are spare in region. A referral center inclusive of all information in region is essential	yes	
IBM - Boulder	no	Not if response time can't be improved - Center should be relocated in Boulder where where more technical and scientific collections are located	yes	
Marathon Oil	yes	Should provide more marketable service	yes	
Nat'l. Center for Atmospheric Research	yes	Growing scientific communities locally need more help in locating technical reports and data	yes	
State Historical Society, Colorado	yes	Some form of concentric organization necessary to avail duplication of service	yes	
Univ. of Colo. Medical Center				
U.S. Bureau Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	yes	Has proven worthwhile and worth original investment	no	No suggestions requested of membership - recommends advisory board

TABLE 9

INTERLIBRARY LOAN VOLUME AND COST ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Library	Items Borrowed	Items Loaned	Average # Attempts to Locate for ILL	Unit Cost of Locating
Brigham Young Univ.	1.542	775	2 - 3	$2.50
Casper Col. Wyo.	35	5	n.a.	n.a.
Colo. School of Mines	563	776	1	$2.00 (est.)
Colorado State Univ.	3,494	2,765	1.37	5.00
Eastern N.Mex.Univ.	569	91	1	n.a.
Fort Hays Kansas State College	1,142	395	approx. 50% not found at 1st place of inquiry	n.a.
Fort Lewis College	297	n.a.	2	$500.00
Hiram Scott Coll.Nebr.	n.a.	-10 (less than 10)	100 (sic)	n.a.
Kansas State Coll.	986	760	1 - 2	$3 - $4.00
Mesa College Lib.	103	72	1	n.a.
N.Dak. State Univ.	613	510	1.2	$5.00
Northe[illegible]tate Coll.	105	58	1.1	5.00
Sherid[illegible] College, Wyo.	119	11	2	.30
S. Da[illegible]tate Univ.	551	820	1.5	n.a.
Templ[illegible]uell College	58	3	2	n.a.
Texas [illegible]ristian Univ.	1,016	1,226	2	$2.50
Tex. [illegible]echnological Coll.	1,745	1,896	2	2.03
University of Arizona	1,269	2,553	2	n.a.
University of Denver	1,496	2,290	1.17	n.a.
University of Kansas	3,863	5,251 2,814 books 2,437 photocopies	1.3	$2.00
			2 (higher for journals than for books)	n.a.
Univ. of N. Dakota	2,631	1,314	2	n.a.
Univ. of S. Dakota	1,479	855	1.2	$ .60
Univ. of Utah	2,352	2,270	3 - 4	4.50
Utah State Univ.	1,065	747	3	n.a.
Western New Mex. Univ.	41	29	1.3	n.a.
Wichita State Univ.	1,593	1,066	1+	$1.20
University of Wyoming	1,911	2,022	1.12	n.a.
University of Colorado	2,635	5,381	3-4 (est.)	$2-2.50 (est.)

3

TABLE 10

INTERLIBRARY LOAN VOLUME AND COST
PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Libraries	Items Borrowed (last fiscal year)	Items Loaned (last fiscal year)	Average # of Attempts to Locate Item for Interlibrary Loan	Unit Cost of Locating
Albuquerque, N.Mex.	110	150	1.3	$1.65 (labor only)
Dallas, Texas	74	387	1	n.a.
Denver, Colo.	1,031	34,561*	1(for 90%) 2-6 (for 10%)	n.a.
Durango, Colo.	698	2,544	n.a.	$ 3.00
Hutchinson, Kan.	181	4,481	n.a.	$ 1.49
Los Alamos, N.Mex.	342	196	1.6	2.90
Ottumwa, Iowa	340	121	2	n.a.
Phoenix, Ariz	107	311	2	$12.00
Pikes Peak Regional, Colo.	887	351	1 - 2	1.50
Salina, Kansas	415	1,150	1	2.50
Sheridan Co., Wyo.	902	10	2	1.00
Sioux Falls, S.Dak.	58	n.a.	1	1.00
Weld County, Colo.	179	1,547	1	.75

TABLE 11

INTERLIBRARY LOAN VOLUME AND COST
STATE LIBRARIES

Library	Items Borrowed	Items Loaned	Attempts in Search	Unit Cost of Locating
Colorado State Lib.	98	23,590	1.5	$1.50
Kansas State Lib.	560	2,014	1	.33
N. Mex. State Lib.	550	3,717	2 - 3	n.a.
N. Dakota State Lib.	2,890	700	3	n.a.
Okla. Dept. of Libs.	3,279	10,512	4	n.a.
S. Dakota State Lib.	1,750	528,537	1 - 2	$3.20
Wyoming State Lib.	100* *Includes only State Library itself. WSL for the Public. Sent 855 requests to Bibliographical Center	75*	1	n.a.
Arizona State Libs.	537	5	2	$1.00

TABLE 12
INTERLIBRARY VOLUME AND COST
SPECIAL LIBRARIES

Library	Items Borrowed	Items Loaned	Attempts in Search	Unit Cost of Locating
Colorado State Historical Society	n.a.	n.a.	5	$15 - $25
ESSA Laboratories	1,132	586	1.1	$2.75
Fort Logan Mental Health Center	148	50	1.5	n.a.
IBM, Boulder	431	216	1	$2.00
Marathon Oil Co.	317	86	1 - 2	n.a.
National Center for Atmospheric Research	250	160	2.3	n.a.
U.S. Bureau of Sport, Fisheries & Wildlife	200	30	2.	n.a.
Univ. of Colorado Medical Center	1,535	6,708	1.5	n.a.

TABLE 13

PREFERRED METHODS OF FINANCING BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER

ACADEMIC LIBRARIES	1*	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Other)
Brigham Young Univ.	(2)					(1)	
Casper College			X				
Colorado School of Mines						X	Charge by number of transactions
Colorado State Univ.			X	X	X	X	
Eastern N.Mex. Univ.			X			X	
Fort Hays, Kansas State College	X						
Fort Lewis College		X		may-be		X	
Hiram Scott College				X			
Kan.State College Pittsburg	X						
Mesa College		(2)	(1)				
N. Dakota Univ.	X						
Northern State Coll. South Dakota						X	
Sheridan College	X					X	
S.Dak.State Univ.	X					X	
Temple Buell Coll.		X		X			Multi-state library contract for services to libs. not covered individually
Texas Christian U.			X			X	

*1) An umbrella fee schedule by which basic membership in the Center is negotiated for all libraries within a state?

2) Individual membership based on a proportion of the library's budget?

3) Basic fee entitling member to a drawing account on X number of transactions, with periodic billing for additional services?

4) Reorganization of the Center as a state agency with contracts for users outside the state?

5) Reorganization of the Center as an agency serving a consortium of universities, with provision for services on a transaction basis to other users?

6) A basic membership fee plus additional charges based upon levels and varieties of services?

7) Other?

TABLE 13 --(cont.)

ACADEMIC (cont.)	1*	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Other)
Texas Tech. Coll.						X	
Univ. of Arizona			X				
Univ. of Colorado			X	X	(1)	X	
Univ. of Denver							
Univ. of N. Dak.	X				X		
Univ. of S. Dak.	X		X				
Univ. of Utah			X			X	
Utah State Univ.	X				X	X	#5 & #6 in addition to #1
Weber College						X	
Western N.Mex. U.		X			X	X	
Wichita State U.				X			
Totals	9	5	8	6	7	13	
Univ. of Colorado				x	x	x	
PUBLIC LIBRARIES							
Albuquerque	X	X	X			X	
Denver	X					X	
Durango		X	X			X	
Hutchinson						X	
Jefferson Co.Colo.	X						
Los Alamos			X				
Ottumwa	X	X				X	Combination of #1 & #6 with #2 if necessary
Phoenix			X			X	
Pikes Peak Regional			X	X		X	
Salina	X						
Sheridan County	X						

*1) An umbrella fee schedule by which basic membership in the Center is negiotiated for all libraries within a state?

2) Individual membership based on a proportion of the library's budget?

3) Basic fee entitling member to a drawing account on X number of transactions, with periodic billing for additional services?

4) Reorganization of the Center as a state agency with contracts for users outside the state?

5) Reorganization of the Center as an agency serving a consortium of universities, with provision for services on a transaction basis to other users?

6) A basic membership fee plus additional charges based upon levels and varieties of services?

7) Other?

TABLE 13 --(cont.)

PUBLIC (cont.)	1*	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Other)
Sioux Falls	X						With additional fee for direct access to Center in
Weld County	(1)	(2)	(1)				First Choice is combination of #1 and #3.
STATE LIBRARIES							
Arizona			X				
Colorado	X			X		X	
Kansas	X	X					Based on present services of Center
New Mexico	X						
North Dakota	X						
Oklahoma	X		X				
South Dakota	X						
Wyoming			X				
SPECIAL LIBRARIES							
ESSA						X	
Ft.Logan Men.Hlth.Cen.	X						
IBM Boulder			X				
Marathon Oil						X	
Nat'l. Center Atmospheric Research			X				
State Hist.Soc.Colo.	(1)				(2)	(3)	
Univ. Colo. Medical						X	
U.S.Bureau-Sport Fisheries		X				X	
Totals	1	2	2	1	1	5	

*1) An umbrella fee schedule by which basic membership in the Center is negiotiated for all libraries within a state?

2) Individual membership based on a proportion of the library's budget?

3) Basic fee entitling member to a drawing account on X number of transactions, with periodic billing for additional services?

4) Reorganization of the Center as a state agency with contracts for users outside the state?

5) Reorganization of the Center as an agency serving a consortium of universities, with provision for services on a transaction basis to other users?

6) A basic membership fee plus additional charges based upon levels and varieties of services?

7) Other?

TABLE 14

COST TO LIBRARIES OF SUBMITTING CARDS TO BIBLIOGRAPHICAL CENTER REGIONAL CATALOG

Library	Unit Cost in Last Fiscal Year (est.)
ACADEMIC	
Brigham Young	.02
Colorado School of Mines	n.a.
Colorado State University	.03
Northern State College, S. Dak.	.07
Sheridan College	.06
South Dakota University	n.a.
Texas Technological College	.05
University of Arizona	.008
University of Colorado	.05
University of Denver	"negligible"
University of Kansas	n.a.
University of South Dakota	.20
University of Utah	.04
Utah State University	.15
PUBLIC	
Albuquerque	.06
Denver	.02
Pikes Peak Regional	.02
Weld County	n.a.

TABLE 14 (cont.)

Library STATE	Unit Cost in Last Fiscal Year (est.)
Arizona	
Colorado	.30
Kansas	.04
New Mexico	n.a.
Oklahoma	.25
South Dakota	.05
Wyoming	n.a.

Average Cost:	.08
Mean Cost:	.05

Total Member Cards Deposited, Last Fiscal Year: 687,779*

Total Cost to Libraries @ .05	$34,459
Total Cost to Libraries at .08	$55,022

---

*Includes 2,045 cards submitted for withdrawal.

TABLE 15

FEES PAID TO CENTER BY TYPE OF LIBRARY

1964 - 1968

Type of Library	1964	1968
Academic	$15,913	$13,770
Public	9,653	783
State	2,515	47,343
Special	4,328	2,769
Other	225	35.60

ERRATA

Page 4. Recommendations 3-9 should be renumbered 4-10. Recommendation 3 should be inserted to read as follows:

> "That consultation and education be recognized as a distinct and important function of the Center, that the desirable kinds and levels of program activity be spelled out, and that these activities be implemented to the extent funds can be obtained."

Page 5. Recommendations 10-14 should be renumbered 11-15. Recommendation 16 should be inserted to read as follows:

> "That the Bibliographical Center explore with the Center for Research Libraries the possible benefits of an affiliation for the purpose of coordinating their respective regional and national programs."

Recommendation 15 should be renumbered 17.

Page 6. Recommendations 16-21 should be renumbered 18-23.

Page 7. Recommendations 22-30 should be renumbered 24-32.

Page 8. Recommendation 31 should be renumbered 33.

Page 38. Line #15. Change 60 to 59.

Page 87. Chapter VI should be renumbered VII.